Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

No. Class
Ex Dono Rev. F. C. Grant Library
Date 1961

25
0

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

AND ITS

NON-JEWISH SOURCES

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/primitivechristi0000carl_n0a6

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

AND ITS

NON-JEWISH SOURCES

BY

CARL CLEMEN, Ph.D., D.D.

PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN

TRANSLATED BY

ROBERT G. NISBET, M.A.

LECTURER IN LATIN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1912

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL
of the
PACIFIC
LIBRARY

BS
2364
C513
912

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

FG
C625

PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION

Of the various demands that have lately been made upon Theology in name of the religious-historical method, there is none so well known as the demand for an inquiry into the dependence of primitive Christianity upon other religions. Nor can any serious objection be offered to this on the ground of principle: for the truth of an idea or the value of an institution is surely altogether independent of its origin. Moreover, it is quite conceivable *a priori* that, like the Israelitish and Jewish religion, whose influence is self-evident, other religions also have left their mark on the oldest form of Christianity, even when it felt itself in the keenest antagonism to them. And accordingly at the present day these inquiries are in such favour that many will think it premature if they are now to be provisionally summarized, or futile if they are to be not only carried to a further stage, but also subjected to criticism. Perhaps, however, the mode of procedure can be improved where it has erred in any point of detail or of principle.

I have just said that the dependence of primitive Christianity upon the Israelitish and Jewish religion is self-evident, and that consequently a fresh demonstration of this connexion is unnecessary. But that religion (and indirectly, therefore, Christianity as well) may have been influenced by still other religions, which must be dealt with if our treatment is not to be one-sided. So far, therefore, as they concern Christianity in any degree, I shall examine also the influences to which the Israelitish and Jewish religion may have been exposed, but not those which would affect only the Old Testament or later Jewish literature.

450

Hitherto I have spoken only of other *religions*: but a similar importance is at various points to be attached to religious-ethical ideas, especially those of philosophical origin. They, too, will have to be considered.

On the other hand, we have no concern with matters that relate only to the mode of expression or the external form in general. No doubt a term or expression has frequently a specific idea linked to it; but apart from this aspect we shall make no attempt to discover how far non-Jewish influences have affected the language of the New Testament or the literary form of its individual books.

Whether certain historical incidents that are of no moment for the development of Christianity—and one may take as an instance (its historicity being presupposed) the mocking of Jesus—have possibly been drawn from other sources, is a question outside our purview. I shall not, however, limit myself to the opinions actually held by the protagonists of Christianity or the writers of the New Testament, but shall extend the inquiry to those which are only presupposed, or even assailed, by them.

In the many fields of investigation external to Theology that I have been compelled to enter in the course of these researches, I should hardly have found my bearings had I not been privileged to receive guidance from the representatives of these various studies in this University. Once again I thank all those who have assisted me with such counsel, for their courtesy and kindness.

It has from the first been my peculiar misfortune that I have been able to identify myself whole-heartedly with none of the theological parties, alternately victorious and vanquished. Not only in details, therefore, but also in its general attitude, this book will please no one entirely: in spite of this, I would fain hope that it may receive unbiassed and fair-minded criticism.

CARL CLEMEN.

Bonn, 1*st August* 1908.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

It is a great pleasure and honour for me to be able to publish an English translation of this work, the original of which appeared in Germany four years ago under the title *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*. As I have, not only in this but also in my other writings, so largely profited by the labours of English and American scholars, I welcome this opportunity of expressing my gratitude by offering them, in their own tongue, such assistance as this book may possibly afford. No one, it is true, will find it easy reading: we Germans, and I in particular, do not possess the fluent style which we value and admire so highly in English and French works.

The German edition has had a very friendly reception, not only on the Continent of Europe, but also from the majority of its English and American reviewers. Where any fault has been found, and where the criticisms were not—like those, for example, of Dr. A. T. Robertson in *The Review and Expositor* (an American journal), vol. vi., 1909—based upon misunderstandings, I have noted the points in this English edition, and have replied to the objections raised. I am particularly grateful to Dr. (now Professor) James Moffatt, who, in the *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, vol. iv., 1908–9, called my attention to some works (especially by English scholars) that had not been cited by me. Any one who attempts, as I have done, to take due account of all the foreign as well as the German literature on a subject, is certain to overlook occasionally some work or article that

deserved no such neglect. I have now examined the books mentioned by Dr. Moffatt, at any rate all those accessible to me, and, so far as they seemed to merit attention, I have referred to them in the appropriate place. Of course I do not profess to have given minute consideration to works that are not specially concerned with the questions here discussed.

I have appended as ample references as I could to all the relevant literature that has appeared since the publication of the German edition, and have accordingly brought the book up to date. Further, in places where I had been guilty of any errors, or had altered my opinion, I have made the necessary changes. This English edition, therefore, as compared with the German, is to some extent a second and revised edition, which may interest even those who possess the work in its original form.

The translator of the book, Mr. R. G. Nisbet, has bestowed much more upon it than is usually expected of a translator. He has verified a large number of the quotations and references, and has called my attention to several passages in which I had not expressed myself with sufficient clearness. I have myself revised the whole of the translation, and can assure the reader that it truthfully represents my meaning. If it reads better than the original, the credit is entirely due to Mr. Nisbet; and I would warmly thank him once again for the great care with which he has performed his task.

CARL CLEMEN.

Bonn, 1*st September* 1912.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

It is unnecessary, I think, to do more than remark on certain points of detail.

The quotations from the Bible and the Apocrypha are made from the English Revised Version, from which I have not departed unless it was obvious that Professor Clemen was following another reading or interpretation, and that the difference had, or might have, some importance. The numbering of the verses in the Old Testament is according to the Hebrew text. For the Apocalyptic and similar literature I have borrowed renderings from the following standard translations:—Charles's translations of the *Book of Jubilees* (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1893–5); the *Book of Enoch* (Eth. Enoch), 1893; the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, 1896; the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 1908: Morfill's translation (edited by Charles) of the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Slav. Enoch), 1896: Ryle and James's translation of the *Psalms of Solomon*, 1891.

The spelling of names from Indian and Persian literature conforms for the most part to that which will be found in the *Sacred Books of the East*. This course has been adopted merely to facilitate reference to the Index Volume of that work. The scheme of transliteration there given involves an elaborate use of italics; and when the whole of such a name had, in conformity with other rules, to be printed in italics, a point is placed below any letter which would have been italicized if the rest of the word had been in roman type. Thus the reader may find Bundahiṣ and also *Bundahiṣ*. The main facts to observe are that *ṣ* = Eng. sh; *ġ* = Eng. j (= Germ. dsch), *e.g.* *Ġâtakas* = Eng. Jâtakas (= Germ.

Dschâtakas); *k* = Eng. ch (= Germ. tsch), *e.g.* *K*andragupta = Eng. Chandragupta (= Germ. Tschandragupta).

The paging of the original German edition is noted in smaller figures at the top of each page (close to the inner margin). I have also supplied references in the footnotes to authorized English translations of German (and other) theological works: but in one or two cases I have not had access to the English translation, or I have found on consulting it (*e.g.* Jülicher's *Introduction*) that the text on the particular page had apparently been so altered in later German editions as to make any reference to the English translation misleading. Where actual quotations from such works are given in the original volume, I have usually quoted from the translation without change, but sometimes have silently corrected mistakes, or altered certain expressions, or recast the passage. For some parts quoted from the Epic of Gilgamesh and kindred literature, I have borrowed sentences or phrases from Jastrow's writings. The excellent English translation of Schweitzer's *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* supplied me with half a page of difficult matter (a long quotation from Seydel) on p. 7, and a phrase or two elsewhere. And in the concluding summary, on p. 372, one or two short clauses are borrowed from the review to which there is a reference on p. 291, n. 3. These are my most flagrant plagiarisms.

There are other obligations which I am no less bound to acknowledge. The author has read the translation most carefully both in manuscript and in proof, and has patiently answered my many inquiries. My friend Mr. W. King Gillies, Senior Classical Master in the High School of Glasgow, has very kindly read the proofs along with me, and made a large number of valuable suggestions. And I ought to add that my translation would have been neither begun nor completed without the affectionate encouragement of my wife, who has so often illumined for me the obscurities of German idiom.

ROBERT G. NISBET.

Glasgow, 14*th October* 1912.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

1. The History of Religious-historical Interpretation . . 1
2. The Method of Religious-historical Interpretation . . 16
3. The Presuppositions of Religious-historical Interpretation . 20

PART I.

A.—Christian Thought in Some of its More General Aspects 41

B.—The Leading Ideas of Christianity. . . . 77

1. The Ideas inherited from Judaism 77
   - *a.* God and Intermediary Beings 77
     - (*α*) God 77
     - (*β*) Intermediary Beings 83
   - *b.* The Last Things 117
     - (*α*) The End of the World 117
     - (*β*) The Life after Death 168
   - *c.* The Moral Ideas 174
     - (*α*) Righteousness 174
     - (*β*) Sin 179
2. The New Ideas of Christianity 182
   - *a.* The Person of Christ 182
   - *b.* The Triadic Formulae 204
3. The Institutions of Primitive Christianity . . . 208
   - *a.* Divine Worship and Church Organization . . 208
   - *b.* Baptism 212
   - *c.* The Lord's Supper 238

PART II.

PAGE

A.—Life and Teaching of Jesus 267
1. The Gospel Narrative as a Whole 267
2. Particular Aspects of the Life and Teaching of Jesus . 287
a. The Stories of the Infancy and Childhood . 287
b. The Baptism and Temptation 314
c. The Public Ministry 318
d. The Passion and Resurrection 333
Appendix: The Primitive Church . . . 335

B.—Pauline Theology 336
1. The Person and Work of Christ 336
2. Isolated Passages 342
Appendix: Post-Pauline Writings 345

C.—The Ideas of the Johannine Writings . . . 352
1. Johannine Theology in General 352
2. Isolated Passages 356

Conclusion 366

INDEXES.

I. General Index 375
II. Scripture Texts and other References 389
III. Greek Words 398
IV. Names of Modern Authors 399

Illustrations 1–12 on two Plates.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

(On the two Plates at the end of the Volume)

FIG.

1. Bas-relief upon the Rocks at Maltaya (see p. 84).
2. Boundary Stone: Period of Nebuchadnezzar I. (see p. 98).
3. Sacred Tree with kneeling Genii (see p. 99 f.).
4. Sacred Tree with Genii (see p. 99 f.).
5. Combat of a Babylonian God with a Monster (see p. 131).
6. Snake Combat (see p. 131).
7. The Mushrushshû (see p. 131).
8. Tree of Life with Divine Beings and Serpent (see p. 181).
9. Portion of the Mithraic Bas-relief found at Osterburken (see p. 181).
10. Sacred Repast of Mithraism (see p. 260).
11. Central Portion of the Mithraic Bas-relief found at Heddernheim (Obverse) (see p. 262).
12. Central Portion of the Mithraic Bas-relief found at Heddernheim (Reverse) (see p. 364).

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY AND ITS NON-JEWISH SOURCES.

INTRODUCTION.

1. The History of Religious-historical Interpretation.

That primitive Christianity is directly or indirectly indebted to non-Jewish religions, is a view that was held at a much earlier date than is commonly supposed: it is, in fact, as old as Christianity itself. For Philo, who elsewhere makes the Greeks learn from Moses,[1] at one point (*Vita Mos.* i. 5, ed. Mangey, ii. 84) represents Moses as having learned from the Greeks; and this statement, if worked out to its consequences, would mean that Jesus and His disciples were indirectly pupils of the same great teachers.

But the first to express the idea plainly was perhaps Celsus, when, as Origen (*Contra Cels.* i. 4) tells us, he called Christianity *οὐ σεμνόν τι καὶ καινὸν μάθημα.*[2]

Next, the worshippers of Mithras, whom the Christians charged with having imitated their ceremonies, may have returned the taunt: but their writings are no longer extant.[3] When, however, as Augustine relates (*In Joh. Ev. Tract.* vii. 1. 6), a certain priest of Cybele was accustomed to say: "Et ipse Pileatus [*i.e.* Attis] Christianus est"—there was

[1] Cp. Elter, *De Gnomologiorum Graecorum Historia atque Origine*, viii., 1895, 224 f.

[2] For other passages, see Keim, *Celsus' wahres Wort*, 1873, 5, n. 2.

[3] Cp. Cumont, *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, i., 1899, 341.

no intention, I think, *pace* Cumont,[1] to assert the dependence of Christianity upon the religion of Attis: and still less does Augustine himself mean this when (*Conf.* vii. 9. 13 f., cp. 20. 26) he says: "Procurasti mihi . . . quosdam Platonicorum libros ex Graeca lingua in Latinam versos: et ibi legi, non quidem his verbis, sed hoc idem omnino multis et multiplicibus suaderi rationibus, quod in principio erat verbum," etc., or (*Retract.* i. 13): "Res ipsa, quae nunc religio Christiana nuncupatur, erat apud antiquos nec defuit ab initio generis humani, quousque Christus veniret in carnem, unde vera religio, quae iam erat, coepit appellari Christiana." This last passage was, on the contrary, intended in the sense in which it is understood by Spiess,[2] who appeals to it as vindicating his collection of "Parallels to the New Testament from the writings of the ancient Greeks": Soltau,[3] therefore, had no right to quote the passage in support of his dissimilar view, which will be mentioned later.

It is only since the sixteenth century that the reproach of Platonizing has again been started, in the first instance only against the Fathers of the Church: Scultetus, however, even declared that Paul was influenced by Heraclitus.[4] In the eighteenth century, Greek learning in general was more than once attributed to Paul,[5] and such a view is occasionally stated even in recent times.

But in regard to non-Jewish *religions*, it was Deism which first took up the charge that had possibly been made by those worshippers of Mithras, and alleged that Christianity as a whole, or Judaism before it, was derived from such faiths. We need not, however, refer to those Deists who have given merely occasional expression to these views.[6] The first separate publication that dealt with this

[1] *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, 1906, 87.

[2] *Logos Spermaticós*, 1871, xxv.

[3] *Das Fortleben des Heidentums in der altchristlichen Kirche*, 1906, 21.

[4] Cp. B. Bauer, *Christus und die Cäsaren*, 1877, 40.

[5] Cp. the short account in Reuss, *Die Geschichte der h. Schriften N.T.s* (1842), [6]1887, 57. [Eng. trans. from 5th ed., *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the N.T.*, 1884, 55.]

[6] Cp. Lechler, *Der englische Deismus*, 1841, 137 f., 375, 392; Tröltsch, art. "Deismus" (*Prot. Realencykl.*[3] iv., 1898, 537 ff.).

question was perhaps the anonymous work (attributed by Lechler[1] to Damilaville), *Le Christianisme dévoilé*.[2] It started by making Moses an Egyptian—a matter with which we are not now concerned: at a later point it represented also the Phoenicians, Persians, "Chaldaeans," Indians, Greeks, and Romans as influencing Judaism and Christianity. "Les différentes nations," we are there told,[3] "auxquelles les Juifs furent respectivement soumis, les avoient infectés d'une multitude de dogmes empruntés du paganisme: ainsi la religion Judaïque, Égyptienne dans son origine, adopta les rites, les notions et une portion des idées des peuples, avec qui les Juifs conversèrent. . . . Le commerce des Juifs et des Chrétiens avec les Grecs, leur fit surtout connoître la philosophie de Platon, si analogue avec l'esprit romanesque des Orientaux, et si conforme au génie d'une religion qui se fit un devoir de se rendre inaccessible à la raison." Then in Germany, Herder,[4] writing with reference to Anquetil Duperron's translation of the Avesta, attempted to show how great had been the influence of these "remains of the wisdom of the Chaldaeans" on Judaism, and through it on the fundamental ideas of the New Testament. "Every one knows," he says,[5] "that the Jews came back [from exile] fully conversant with this dialect and this mode of thought. Their Hebrew and their Mosaic spirit were gone: the eyes with which they now regarded their Scriptures, the hands with which they handled the furniture of the temple, were Chaldaean. Their hopes of the future, their new spirit of interpretation and exposition, the Pharisaism which they traced with so much pride from Sinai, had a Sinai not so remote, Chaldaea."

Dupuis[6] believed that he could derive the whole of Judaism and Christianity — dissolving its founder into mythical vapour — from other religions, particularly the Persian. "La théologie des Juifs," he writes,[7] "et celle des

[1] *Deismus*, 442. [2] 1767. [3] *Christianisme*, 40.
[4] *Erläuterungen zum N.T. aus einer neuentdeckten morgenländisch. Quelle*, 1775.
[5] *Herders sämtl. Werke*, hrsg. v. Suphan, vii. 338.
[6] *Origine de tous les cultes*, iii., 1794. [7] *Ibid.* 86.

Chrétiens, qui est établie sur elle, ne sont que des émanations de la doctrine ancienne et primitive des Mages, et qu' un corollaire des principes constitutifs de la science mystique des disciples de Zoroastre." Or in a later passage:[1] "Dans leur théologie, comme dans leurs mystères et leur légende, il n'y a rien qui ne se trouve dans toutes les autres religions, avec des formes plus ou moins différentes." Of course, it is only in reference to specific points that any attempt is made to prove this: particularly in regard to the doctrine of the Fall and Redemption (which, he alleges, is the central principle of Christianity), and that of the Unity and Trinity of God. Finally, Dupuis supplies an interpretation of the Apocalypse under the title, *Examen d'un ouvrage phrygien, contenant la doctrine apocalyptique des initiés aux mystères de la lumière et du soleil équinoxial de printemps, sous le symbole de l'agneau ou d'aries, premier des douze signes.*[2]

The view of these questions that was current in England at the beginning of last century may be illustrated by a sentence from Keats, which Moffatt[3] quotes. In 1819 the poet wrote to his brother and sister: "It is pretty generally suspected that the Christian scheme has been copied from the ancient Persian and Greek philosophers."

In the same year there appeared Richter's book, *Christianity and the Earliest Religions of the East.*[4] Its author had satisfied himself[5] "that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity had all been previously enunciated in India and Persia." "Christianity," he says more precisely,[6] "appears to be nothing but a purified Essenism, and Essenism to be a copy of the primeval religion of Brahmâ, the most important tenets of which had been preserved in the mysteries and esoteric philosophizings of all peoples." Similarly Nork[7] is of opinion that "Jewish theology as a whole is a compound of the most diverse dogmas and forms

[1] *Origine*, iii. 137 f.

[2] For a criticism of this, cp. Calkoen, *Examen du système de Dupuis et Volney sur l'origine de la religion mosaïque et chrétienne*, 1802.

[3] "Zoroastrianism and Primitive Christianity," *Hibb. Journ.* 1902–3, i. 763.

[4] *Das Christentum und die ältesten Religionen des Orients.*

[5] *Ibid.* iv. [6] *Ibid.* 307.

[7] *Biblische Mythologie des A. u. N.T.s*, i., 1842, vi. 3,

of worship, belonging originally to foreign nations." But detailed proof is still more to seek than in Richter's volume.

I should perhaps not have cited these last works if modern writers on religious-historical questions, *e.g.* Gunkel[1] and Jeremias,[2] did not expressly appeal to them: and, in fact, it is not impossible that they contain some truth. Similarly, as we proceed with our chronological survey, works will occasionally be mentioned that have little or no claim to be in such good company.

Bunsen[3] revived the view that "Chaldaeo-Persian" influences had affected Christianity; subsequently he admitted Buddhist influences as well: and in both points he was followed by Burnouf.[4] Kohut[5] traced only Jewish angelology and daemonology to foreign religions, and specifically to Parsism: Jacolliot,[6] however, made Jesus a student in Egypt and in India from His twelfth to His thirtieth year.

Schrader was the first to furnish a compilation of those elements in the Old Testament which, in his opinion, were borrowed from the Assyro-Babylonian religion. His work was subsequently issued in a revised form by Winckler and Zimmern.[7] Winckler had previously published a history of Israel[8] viewed from this standpoint, and various minor writings, in all of which he had urged that this mode of interpretation related only to the form; while Zimmern had been the author of a brochure on the triadic expression "Father, Son, and Spirit"

[1] *Zum religionsgeschichtl. Verständnis des N.T.s*, 1903, 1, n. 1.

[2] *Im Kampf um Babel und Bibel*, 1903, 25; *Babylonisches im N.T.*, 1905, 3, n. 2.

[3] *The Hidden Wisdom of Christ*, 1875; *The Angel-Messiah of Buddhists, Essenes and Christians*, 1880. The latter work has not come into my hands.

[4] "Un essai d'histoire religieuse," *Revue des deux mondes*, 1865, lx. 712 ff.; "Le Bouddhisme en Occident," *ibid.*, 1888, lxxxviii. 340 ff. Cp. also *La science des religions*, [4]1885, 105.

[5] "Über die jüdische Angelologie und Dämonologie," *Abhandlungen zur Kunde des Morgenlands*, iv. 3, 1866.

[6] *La bible dans l'Inde*, 1868; *Christna et le Christ* (1874), [3]1874, 323 ff. I have had no opportunity of consulting either of these works.

[7] *Die Keilinschriften und das A.T.* (1872), [3]1903, i., ii. [Eng. trans. from 2nd ed., *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the O.T.*, 1885–8].

[8] 1895, 1900.

in the New Testament,[1] and of an article, "*Bread of Life*" *and* "*Water of Life*" *in Babylonian Thought and in the Bible.*[2] Since the revision of Schrader's work, Zimmern has made some slight contributions to the Babel-Bible controversy (which will be mentioned below) and to the discussion of the Christ-myth theory.[3]

E. Havet[4] and B. Bauer,[5] the latter of whom had already declared that the documents of Christianity were all spurious and its founder mythical, derived it in all its essentials from Graeco-Roman philosophy. "The poets, rhetoricians, and philosophers of early Imperial times," Bauer[6] wrote, "founded a spiritual Rome, in whose granaries were matured the original ideas of those aphorisms which afterwards, in the formulae of the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles, were disseminated among the masses of the Roman Empire." And again, the second part of *The Freethinker's Text-book*,[7] written by Mrs. Annie Besant, described Christianity as only a poor imitation of various forms of pagan thought; and Macfie carried this fanatical parallelization still further when addressing the Sunday Lecture Society in 1879.[8]

Seydel[9] has the merit of having for the first time collected with some completeness the Buddhist parallels to the Gospels and the first two chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. For the later history of Christianity he furnishes only suggestions. He divided his parallels, originally at least, into the following three main classes:[10]

[1] *Vater, Sohn und Fürsprecher in der babylonischen Gottesverehrung*, 1896.

[2] "Lebensbrot und Lebenswasser im Babylonischen und in der Bibel," *Archiv f. Religionswiss.*, 1899, 165 ff.

[3] *Keilinschriften u. Bibel nach ihrem religionsgeschichtl. Zusammenhang*, 1903; *Zum Streit um die Christusmythe*, 1910.

[4] *Le christianisme et ses origines*, 1872–84.

[5] *Christus.* [6] *Ibid.* 150. [7] 1876 ff.

[8] *Religious Parallelisms and Symbolisms, Ancient and Modern.* Neither of the last two publications is at present accessible to me.

[9] *Das Evangelium Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zur Buddha-Sage und Buddha-Lehre mit fortlaufender Rücksicht auf andere Religionskreise untersucht*, 1882; "Buddha und Christus," *Nord u. Süd*, 1883, xxvii. 195 ff.—separately, 1884; *Religion u. Wissenschaft*, 1887, 351 ff.; *Die Buddha-Legende und das Leben Jesu nach den Evangelien*, 1884, [2](edited by M.S.) 1897.

[10] *Evangelium*, 296.

"(*a*) Those in which the points of resemblance can without difficulty be explained as due to the influence of similar sources and motives in the two cases.

"(*b*) Those which exhibit such a specific and unexpected agreement that it appears artificial to explain it by the action of similar causes, and the dependence of one upon the other commends itself as the most natural explanation.

"(*c*) Those in which there exists a reason for the occurrence of the idea only within the sphere of one of the two religions, or in which, at least, it can very much more easily be conceived as originating within the one than within the other, so that the inexplicability of the phenomenon within the one domain gives ground for seeking its source within the other."

Further, within the second class, Seydel[1] parted off those cases "in which an independent parallel origination would be the least plausible hypothesis" from those where it would be possible, but still, "in view of the proof already given of the priority of Buddhist narratives," would not be correct. Latterly he allowed this distinction to fall entirely into the background; and Lillie[2] also, in the judgment of van den Bergh van Eysinga,[3] has "in many of his parallels jumbled together ripe fruit and green, and [has] not invariably observed the moderation of the scholar who preceded him."

In the year 1889 classical scholarship began to share in our investigations, at first, indeed, only in works that did not bear exclusively or primarily on early Christianity and Judaism—which, therefore, it would be premature to cite at this point. Still, as it is chiefly concerned with these religions, Hochart's work, *Études d'histoire religieuse*,[4] may be named here. Steck[5] expressed a view regarding the relationship of Christianity to Buddhism in general agreement with Seydel's; Anrich examined the ancient Mysteries and their influence on Christianity,[6] but, so far as primitive

[1] *Evangelium*, 298 f.

[2] *Buddhism in Christendom, or Jesus the Essene*, 1887.

[3] *Indische Einflüsse auf evangelische Erzählungen* (1904), ²1909, 20.

[4] 1890.

[5] *Der Einfluss des Buddhismus auf das Christentum*, 1892.

[6] *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, 1894.

Christianity is concerned, came to an essentially negative result.

A further stage is marked by the appearance of Gunkel's *Creation and Chaos*,[1] *a Religious-historical Study of Genesis, chap.* i., *and Revelation, chap.* xii., which attempted to derive these and many other sections of the Old and New Testaments from Babylonian thought. Subsequently there appeared from the pen of the same author an article, *The Inscribing Angel Nabû in the Old Testament and in Judaism*,[2] another work entitled *Aids to the Religious-historical Understanding of the New Testament*,[3] which treated many of the questions to be raised here, and *Israel and Babylonia*,[4] a contribution to the Babel-Bible dispute.

Wobbermin published *Religious-historical Studies on the Influence exercised by the Ancient Mysteries upon Primitive Christianity*,[5] while Stave wrote on the influence of Parsism on Judaism,[6] which has in its turn left its mark on Christianity. In the same year, Edmunds[7] began to publish his studies of Buddhist parallels to the Gospels, which must be mentioned at this point because here and there the passages quoted are also regarded as the prototypes of the New Testament narratives. The author wrote thus of them in 1904 :[8] "In my unpublished historical introduction" —it has appeared since that date, but is not accessible to the present writer—"I have admitted the possibility of a knowledge of the Buddhist Epic on the part of Luke; but his use of it, if actual, was very slight and almost entirely

[1] *Schöpfung und Chaos*, 1895.

[2] "Der Schreiberengel Nabû im A.T. und im Judentum," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1898, 294 ff.

[3] *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des N.T.s*, 1903.

[4] *Israel u. Babylonien*, 1903.

[5] *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Frage der Beeinflussung des Urchristentums durch das antike Mysterienwesen*, 1896.

[6] *Über den Einfluss des Parsismus auf das Judentum*, 1898.

[7] Articles in *The Open Court*, 1898–1903; *A Dialogue on Former Existence and on the Marvellous Birth and Career of the Buddhas between Gotamo and his Monks*, (1899), [2]1903; *Buddhist and Christian Gospels* (1902), [2]1904, [3]1905, [4]1908–9. I know only the writings issued separately, the former in its first, the latter in its second edition.

[8] *Gospels*, 3.

confined to his Infancy Section."[1] More recently, however, he describes two passages in John's Gospel (7^{38} 12^{34}) as quotations from Pâli writings,[2] and remarks in general:[3] "In *Buddhist and Christian Gospels*, p. 49, are these words: 'I would not, with Seydel, extend the Buddhist influence to the entire Christian Epic, but limit it to the Gospel of Luke, and perhaps John. Even in doing this much, I submit it only as an hypothesis.' In the next edition the last sentence will be cancelled, and the order of Luke and John reversed. The case for John is now stronger than that for Luke." Barrows wrote on *Mythical and Legendary Elements in the New Testament*.[4]

In the following year there appeared Robertson's first work[5] on this subject, in which he sought to explain almost the whole Gospel history as mythical. The fundamental idea of his second work[6] is described by himself in these terms: "(1) that the Gospel story of the Last Supper, Passion, Betrayal, Trial, Crucifixion, and Resurrection is visibly a transcript of a Mystery Drama, and not originally a narrative; and (2) that that Drama is demonstrably (as historic demonstration goes) a symbolic modification of an original rite of human sacrifice, of which it preserves certain verifiable details."

Van den Bergh van Eysinga, in a compendious work, discussed *Indian Influences on Gospel Narratives*;[7] these influences he acknowledged in nine cases. At the same time,

[1] Cp. also, *Can the Pâli Pitakas aid us in fixing the Text of the Gospels?* 1906.

[2] *Buddhist Texts quoted as Scripture by the Gospel of John*, 1906.

[3] *Ibid.* 20.

[4] *New World*, 1899, 272 ff.

[5] *Christianity and Mythology*, 1900. The third part, "The Gospel Myths," has been published in German under the title *Die Evangelien-Mythen*, 1910.

[6] *Pagan Christs, Studies in Comparative Hierology* (1903), [2]1911, xxi. The criticism with which the author has favoured me on p. 435 ff. is directed only against the methodological principles which follow in the second of my introductory sections: if these principles are correct, then I had no more need than other writers to examine Robertson's own assertions in detail. Still, in the book which I published last year (1911), *Der geschichtliche Jesus*, 29 f., I have given some further instances of his positions.

[7] *Indische invloeden op oude christelijke verhalen*, 1901; German under the title given on p. 7.

Reitzenstein published *Two Religious-historical Questions*:[1] but only the second of these, namely, "Myths of Creation and the Doctrine of the Logos," comes within our purview. Of his later publications a paper on *Eschatology and the History of Religion*[2] should also be mentioned.

Böklen's work, *The Connexion of Judaeo-Christian with Persian Eschatology*,[3] does not primarily fall to be considered here: for it is not its author's intention "to pronounce a judgment on the disputed question of the dependence of Judaism upon Parsism, or to give an explanation of the similarity between the Jewish and the Persian religion."[4] But incidentally he also furnishes some "aids to the solution of the problem of indebtedness":[5] and in the interests of this problem Moffatt[6] also examined other views common to Zoroastrianism and primitive Christianity. In the same year there appeared Delitzsch's first lecture on *Bible and Babel*,[7] which did not, it is true, contain much that was novel: but, as it attracted the interest of the German Emperor, it caused a general stir, and greatly advanced the study of religious-historical questions. We have already had frequent occasion to mention writings which this Babel-Bible controversy evoked: at this point in particular we have to name those of Jeremias,[8] who, like Winckler, as a general rule would derive nothing but the form from Babylon. Nevertheless he seems to admit more than a surface influence in the case of Pauline angelology and eschatology,[9] though subsequently he says: "Passages like

[1] *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen.*

[2] "Religionsgeschichte u. Eschatologie," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1912, 1 ff.

[3] *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der persischen Eschatologie*, 1902.

[4] *Ibid.* 4. [5] *Ibid.* 35, n. 2, 146.

[6] *Hibbert Journal*, 1902–3, i. 763 ff.; 1903–4, ii. 347 ff.

[7] *Bibel und Babel.* The second lecture does not come within the range of the present work; the third (which, however, is not reckoned as such) appeared in 1904; the so-called third in 1905; a final one, entitled *Mehr Licht*, in 1907. [Eng. trans., *Bible and Babel*, Two Lectures, 1903.]

[8] Cp. p. 5, n. 2 above; also *Das A.T. im Lichte des alten Orients* (1904), [2]1906 [Eng. trans., *The O.T. in the Light of the Ancient East*, 1911]; *Der Einfluss Babyloniens auf das Verständnis des A.T.s*, 1908.

[9] *Babylonisches*, 5, n. 2, 86.

Jude [6], 2 P 2[4], and, on the other hand, Jude [9] (cp. Rev 12[7ff.]), do not stand on the same footing as the Judaeo-Persian teaching on the subject of angels. They are a product of the same Oriental views as gave rise to Jewish angelology; however, they are not, like it, purely mythological, but stand for religious realities."[1] Here, as elsewhere, Jeremias has left his exact meaning somewhat obscure.

In the year 1903 there began to appear also the series of *Inquiries relative to the Religion and Literature of the Old and New Testaments.*[2] In the words of the prospectus, the series was intended to furnish "a rallying-place for all those works that unite in the endeavour to examine and set forth the history of the religion of the Old and New Testaments, in its connexion with those kindred religions of antiquity that were nearest to it in time and location." The first number issued is from the pen of Heitmüller, and bears the title, "*In the Name of Jesus*,"[3] *a Linguistic and Religious-historical Inquiry relative to the New Testament, with special reference to Baptism in early Christianity.* Also his second work, *Paul's View of Baptism and the Lord's Supper*,[4] is described more precisely as "an account and a religious-historical elucidation" of the Apostle's doctrine. In 1903 there appeared also Radau's article on *Bel, the Christ of Ancient Times*,[5] and the first of Mills' works dealing with Persian influences on Judaism.[6]

O. Pfleiderer discussed *The Early Christian Conception of Christ: its Significance and Value in the History of Religion*,[7] and laid down even in the introduction the principle that

[1] *Das A.T.*, 374, n. 3 [Eng. trans. ii. 55, n. 2].

[2] *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des A. u. N.T.s.*

[3] *Im Namen Jesu.*

[4] *Taufe u. Abendmahl bei Paulus*, 1904.

[5] *Monist*, 1903, 67 ff.; separately, 1908.

[6] *Zoroaster, Philo and Israel*, i., 1903–4. Since then he has published the following:—*Zarathustra, Philo, the Achaemenids and Israel*, 1906; "Avesta Eschatology compared with the Books of Daniel and Revelation," *Monist*, 1907, 321 ff., 583 ff.; "Exilic Jewish Eschatology: in how far was it Zoroastrian?" *Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review*, 1907, iii. 23. 98 ff.; "The 'Ahuna Vairya' and the Logos," *ibid.*, iii. 24. 92 ff.

[7] *Das Christusbild des urchristlichen Glaubens in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, 1903 [Eng. trans. under the title given above, 1905].

"Jewish prophecy, Rabbinical teaching, Oriental Gnosis, and Greek philosophy had already mingled their colours upon the palette from which the portrait of Christ in the New Testament Scriptures was painted." [1] In a later and separate work he described the *Preparation for Christianity in Greek Philosophy*.[2] On the other hand, Völter's book, *Egypt and the Bible*,[3] in spite of its comprehensive title, does not come within our purview: it is concerned only with aspects of the Old Testament that have left no after-effects in the New. But Cheyne's *Bible Problems and the New Material for their Solution* [4] calls for particular mention: for the new material is furnished by other religions. Cheyne makes a similar distinction to that drawn by Winckler and Jeremias. "The form is derived from the pre-Christian Oriental and Jewish tradition, and is fit matter for archaeological criticism; the spiritual contents appeal, not to the critic as such, but to spiritual men." [5] Biblical belief in the witchcraft of names was investigated by Brandt.[6] The present writer [7] collected the most important religious-historical elucidations of New Testament ideas that had till then been put forward—a work which I name only here and shall not again refer to. Bousset wrote in the same year on a similar subject,[8] and in 1912 on *Christianity and Mystery Religion*.[9] Kalthoff, who had attempted to explain Christianity primarily by economic conditions, added to these in a later work [10] the influences of Greek philosophy.

Among the religious-historical works published in the year 1905, the most important was Gressmann's study, *The*

[1] *Christusbild*, 4 [Eng. trans. 9]; also *Religion u. Religionen*, 1906, 208 ff., 217, 232.

[2] *Vorbereitung des Christentums in der griechischen Philosophie*, 1906.

[3] *Ägypten und die Bibel* (1903), [4]1909.

[4] 1904. [5] *Bible Problems*, 26.

[6] "De tooverkracht van namen in O. en N.T.," *Teylers Theol. Tijds.*, 1904, 3. 355 ff.; cp. also *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1904, 2338 ff.

[7] *Die religionsgeschichtliche Methode in der Theologie*, 1904.

[8] "Die Religionsgeschichte u. das N.T.," *Theol. Rundschau*, 1904, 265 ff., 311 ff., 353 ff.

[9] "Christentum u. Mysterienreligion," *Theol. Rundschau*, 1912, 41 ff.

[10] *Die Entstehung des Christentums*, 1904 [Eng. trans., *The Rise of Christianity*, 1907].

Origin of Israelitish and Jewish Eschatology,[1] which is, of course, at the same time Christian Eschatology: he found that it had originated in foreign influences. Baljon[2] examined the religious-historical explanations of New Testament ideas that had till then been advanced: Feine elucidated the relation of *Stoicism and Christianity*,[3] and subsequently dealt with *Babylonian Influences in the New Testament*:[4] similarly Fiebig,[5] who followed in the footsteps of Jeremias. Butler wrote on *The Greek Mysteries and the Gospel Narrative*;[6] W. Köhler, under the title *The Keys of Peter*,[7] "attempted a religious-historical explanation of Mt 16[18f.]"; W. B. Smith[8] endeavoured to show that the name Nazoraean was originally applied to a deity, and in the following year he collected these and other studies and published them in book form.

In the same year, Jensen issued the first volume of his work, *The Epic of Gilgamesh in the Literature of the World*,[9] the sub-title of which is "The Origins of the Old Testament Legends of Patriarchs, Prophets, and Deliverers, and of the New Testament Legend of Jesus." For in his opinion the matter may be summed up thus: "A Jesus with a history such as is related in the Gospels, who is the author of the discourses there reported, . . . never really existed; consequently there is no historical tradition regarding him."[10] In the brochure, *Moses, Jesus, Paul*,[11] this mode of explanation was extended to the third of these personages. Bolland[12]

[1] *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie.*

[2] *De vruchten die de beoefening van de geschiedenis der godsdiensten oplevert voor de studie van het nieuwe testament* (1905) [German trans., "Die Früchte des Studiums der Religionsgeschichte, usw.," in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1906, 50 ff.].

[3] *Theol. Lit.-Blatt*, 1905, 73 ff.

[4] "Über babylonische Einflüsse im N.T.," *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 1906, 696 ff.

[5] *Babel u. das N.T.*, 1905. [6] *Nineteenth Century*, 1905, lvii. 490 ff.

[7] "Die Schlüssel des Petrus," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1905, 214 ff.

[8] "Meaning of the Epithet Nazorean," *Monist*, 1905, 25 ff.; *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, 1906.

[9] *Das Gilgameschepos in der Weltliteratur.* [10] *Ibid.* 1026.

[11] *Moses, Jesus, Paulus* (1909), [3]1910. Cp. also, *Hat der Jesus der Evangelien wirklich gelebt?* 1910.

[12] *Het eerste Evangelie in het licht van oude gegevens*, 1906; *Gnosis en Evangelie*, 1906; *De evangelische Jozua*, 1907; *De achtergrond der evangelien*, 1907; *Het evangelie*, 1910; *De Theosophie in Christendom en Jodendom*, 1910.

began at the same time his attempts to derive the whole of Christianity from Alexandrianism. Soltau investigated *The Survival of Heathenism in the Early Church*,[1] and that term is intended to include the Church of New Testament times. Miss Alice Grenfell [2] and Hollmann [3] described in detail the influence of Egyptian and Persian religion. J. Böhmer wrote on *Traces of the Kingdom of God among the Nations*,[4] and examined the origin of the idea of the Kingdom of God; subsequently, under the title *Christianity and the History of Religion*,[5] he extended his inquiry to the origin of other ideas. Metzger's book, *Les quatre évangiles, matériaux pour servir à l'histoire des origines orientales du Christianisme*, is only a collection of materials.[6]

In 1907 there appeared in the first place a work by Hehn, *Hebdomad and Sabbath among the Babylonians and in the Old Testament*;[7] then *Jonah, a Study in the Comparative History of Religion*,[8] by H. Schmidt; of smaller works an article by Campbell on *The Christian Doctrine of Atonement as influenced by Semitic Religious Ideas*,[9] and another by M. W. Müller on *The Apocalyptic Horsemen*.[10] The following year witnessed the publication of Deissmann's book, *Light from the Ancient East*,[11] in which the non-literary records of Roman Imperial times were made to contribute to the understanding of the New Testament, not only in its linguistic and literary connexions, but in its relation also to the history of civilization and religion. In addition there was an article by Jevons on *Hellenism and Christianity*.[12] At the

[1] For German title, see p. 2, n. 3 above.

[2] "Egyptian Mythology and the Bible," *Monist*, 1906, 169 ff.

[3] "Das Spätjudentum u. der Parsismus," *Zeitschr. f. Missionskunde*, 1906, 97 ff., 140 ff.

[4] "Reichgottesspuren in der Völkerwelt," *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, 1906, 1. 65 ff.

[5] *Christentum u. Religionsgeschichte*, 1909.

[6] I know this book only from the notice of it which appeared in the *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1907, 717 f.

[7] *Siebenzahl u. Sabbat bei den Babyloniern u. im A.T.* [8] *Jona.*

[9] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1906–7, v. 329 ff.

[10] "Die apokalyptischen Reiter," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1907, 290 ff.

[11] *Licht vom Osten* [Eng. trans. under the title given above, 1910].

[12] *Harvard Theological Review*, 1908, 169 ff.

International Congress for the History of Religions, held at Oxford, Bertholet delivered a paper on *The Religious-historical Problem of Later Judaism*,[1] and von Orelli another on *Religious Wisdom as cultivated in Old Israel in common with Neighbouring Peoples*.[2] Again, in the following year there appeared *The Christ-Myth*,[3] by Drews, whose pronouncements Böhtlingk supported in his brochure, *Materials for the Elucidation of the Christ-Myth*:[4] both authors, as the names of their writings indicate, controvert the historicity of Jesus. Drews published the closing chapter of his book separately under the title *The Peter-Legend*.[5] Heinrici wrote on *Hellenism and Christianity*;[6] Kennedy on *Apostolic Preaching and Emperor-Worship*;[7] Brückner on *The Dying and Rising God-Saviour in Oriental Religions, and their Relation to Christianity*;[8] Issleib propounded the question, *Does the Story of Christ's Birth come from Egypt?*[9] In 1910, A. Bauer wrote on *Hellenism and Christianity*,[10] Jacoby on *Ancient Mystery-Religions and Christianity*,[11] Koch on *The Influence of Parsism on the Jewish and Christian Religion*,[12] while Lublinski investigated *The Rise of Christianity from Ancient Civilization*,[13] denying once more the existence of a historical Jesus. A book by Carus on *The Pleroma, an Essay on the Origin of Christianity*, has not come into my hands. Finally, in 1911 there appeared an essay by Perdelwitz on *Mystery-Religion and the Problem of the First Epistle of Peter*,[14] and a paper by

[1] *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, 1908, i. 272 ff.; also in German under the title *Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Spätjudentums*, 1909.

[2] *Transactions*, i. 284 ff.

[3] *Die Christusmythe*, 1909 [Eng. trans., *The Christ Myth*, 1910].

[4] *Zur Aufhellung der Christusmythe.*

[5] *Die Petruslegende*, 1910.

[6] *Hellenismus u. Christentum.*

[7] *Expositor*, 1909, 7th ser., vii. 289 ff.

[8] *Der sterbende u. auferstehende Gottheiland, usw.*

[9] *Protestantenblatt*, 1909, 3 ff. = *Eisenacher Zeitung* of June 17, 1909; cp. also "Sind die Geburtsgeschichte Christi u. die christl. Dreieinigkeitslehre von Ägypten beeinflusst?" *Klio*, 1909, 383 f.

[10] *Vom Griechentum zum Christentum.*

[11] *Die antiken Mysterienreligionen u. das Christentum.*

[12] "Parsismens Indflydelse paa Jödedom og Kristendom," *Teol. Tidsskr.*, 1910.

[13] *Die Entstehung des Christentums aus der antiken Kultur.*

[14] *Die Mysterienreligion u. das Problem des ersten Petrusbriefes.*

Loisy on *The Christian Mystery*;[1] in 1912 a series of papers by Kennedy on *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*.[2] As for reviews, I do not cite them at all, though many of them are known to be as important as independent treatises or writings; and, of course, I do not refer to incidental remarks occurring in works of a more general nature, which it is still more impossible to name at this point. In their own place they will be duly discussed. But, first of all, the question must be raised, How is one to judge all these endeavours after a religious-historical interpretation of the New Testament, and by what principles are new attempts to be guided? This will be the subject of inquiry in the second of our introductory sections.

2. The Method of Religious-historical Interpretation.

These attempts having been made to derive primitive Christianity, directly or indirectly, from non-Jewish religions, it may appear superfluous to examine in detail those of them which start from untenable presuppositions or lead to untenable consequences. And, in fact, my readers' time and my own is too valuable to be spent on the criticism of popular writings that do not even endeavour to prove their stupendous assertions. Can one not in like manner dispense with a scrutiny of works the writers of which—and one may name not only B. Bauer, but also Bolland, Drews, Jensen, Kalthoff, Lublinski, and W. B. Smith—reach the conclusion that all the Pauline Epistles are spurious, and that the whole, or almost the whole, of the traditional account of Jesus is unhistorical? In another way, again, Seydel has made his theory inadmissible for many, by postulating, in his tenderness for its requirements, "a poetic-apocalyptic Gospel of very early date, which fitted its Christian material . . . into the frame of a Buddhist type of Gospel,"[3]—but Synoptic study has never put us on the track of such a thing. And yet it is here particularly evident that when the auxiliary hypothesis falls, it does not

[1] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1911–2, x. 45 ff. [2] *Expositor*, 1912, 8th ser., i. 289 ff. etc.
[3] *Evangelium*, 304.

necessarily carry the whole theory along with it, just as there may possibly be some truth in the other theories, in spite of their impossible consequences. We shall therefore at this point, with a view to our later treatment, lay down only the following principle: A religious-historical explanation is impossible if it necessarily leads to untenable consequences or proceeds from untenable presuppositions.

A second principle ought to be no less obvious, this, namely, that the sense of the New Testament passage, as well as the contents of the non-Jewish idea, must first be fully ascertained. This principle is stated here simply because it is in fact so often violated: a Christian, or a Jewish, or, it may be, an Old Testament idea is derived from a non-Jewish one without any right understanding of either the one or the other. No doubt this behaviour is intelligible in view of the diversity of the subjects with which religious-historical writers desire to be conversant; but a trustworthy result is, of course, to be reached only when both of these conditions are fulfilled. In the following pages, therefore, I shall often first of all examine somewhat thoroughly the meaning both of the New Testament ideas and of the similar ideas in non-Jewish thought; and only thereafter shall I think of deriving the former from the latter. Indeed, some further conditions must first be satisfied.

"We ought never to assume," says Cheyne,[1] "that ideas of an advanced religion have been altogether borrowed, until we have done our best to discover any germs of them in the native religious literature." When, however, such germs have been discovered, one must not necessarily suppose that he has explained the whole idea: it may in the particular case emerge in a form which points definitely to external origin. Accordingly Oldenberg[2] insists that first of all the question must be asked, "Does the system of thought and belief that is alleged to be the borrower—the early Christian, let us say—exhibit or fail to exhibit within its own domains the conditions that would adequately explain the phenomena in question without any hypothesis of dependence?" and in

[1] *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, 1891, 269.
[2] *Indien u. die Religionswissenschaft*, 1906, 17.

the second place, "Does the configuration of the phenomena show any abnormalities, warpings, sutures, fissures, the existence of which would confirm the view that foreign elements are present?" Gunkel[1] also is amply justified in adopting the following method: "We argue . . . first of all from the impression which the Jewish or Christian material itself makes, and it is only at the end that we produce our comparison with foreign religions, on which it is the more general practice to base the whole or the greater part of the demonstration." For if one begins with the comparison, one often derives from other religions what is fully intelligible without external derivation:[2] one must always, therefore, begin by proving that it is *not* fully intelligible by itself; then and then only is the religious-historical method justified in intervening, and in so doing it really, as Bousset[3] says, "leads to its goal, *i.e.*, to conclusive demonstration." But our list of rules is not yet complete.

For, in the fourth place, the non-Jewish idea that is brought in as explanation must really in some degree correspond to the Christian one. This truism would require no special mention were it not in point of fact so often neglected. A comparison is made with ideas that have hardly anything in common with the idea to be explained:[4] in reality it remains unexplained. Yet here also one must

[1] *Verständnis*, 38.

[2] Kuenen laid down the principle that derivation from a foreign set of legends is permissible only when it is clear that the range of ideas within which the writer lives does not furnish an adequate explanation. To this Seydel, *Buddha-Legende*, 4, raises the following objection: "A gold ring may have been abstracted from a room by a raven, and equally well by a human inmate of the house, if the latter no less than the former was in the vicinity and had access to the room: one's final judgment will depend on the preponderance of the indicia one way or the other." But we must observe that among these indicia, vicinity and opportunity of access will take a foremost place. That there is no necessary connexion between sayings verbally coincident is shown by Hopkins, *India Old and New*, 1901, 150 f., by various instances from the Rig Veda and the Old Testament.

[3] *Theol. Rundschau*, 1904, 318.

[4] Nork, *Biblische Mythologie*, i. ix., even wrote: "The author hopes that he may have satisfied all reasonable demands, since he has endeavoured, by means of the numbers of his proofs, to make amends for their individual insufficiency."

not expect too much: it is enough if the idea in question corresponds in some degree to the Christian one. For an idea has seldom been appropriated without some alteration: but however great the dissimilarity, there must be an element that corresponds in some degree.

And, in the fifth place, this element must have been already in existence: an idea that is subsequent in its emergence cannot, of course, have given rise to one previously existent. If such ideas, then, are employed to explain the New Testament, the explanation is a total failure: all that we can do is to ask if the inverse relation is not the true one. Yet even this principle must not be driven too far: an idea may, of course, be of a much earlier date than the source in which it first happens to meet us. But here again it is one's first business to show that this is certain or probable: failing such proof, ideas of that sort must be left out of the discussion.

Nor is this enough: it must, in the sixth place, be shown in regard to any foreign idea that it was really in a position to influence Christianity, or Judaism before it, and how. If that cannot be proved, then the idea in question is of no use for our purpose. Still in certain circumstances we must dispense with such proof. "Personne, que je sache," says de la Vallée-Poussin,[1] "ne connaît les voies suivies par les fables dans leur voyage d'Occident en Orient, ou vice versa ni n'est renseigné par aucun témoignage positif sur les relations qui ont permis leur migration bien avant Alexandre. On se tient néanmoins assuré de la commune origine d'une partie du folk-lore indo-grec." Thus in the religious domain also a connexion, indeed a greater antiquity, and finally even a corresponding idea, can often only be postulated: if it is really required to account for some Christian idea, such a postulation is perfectly legitimate. But, of course, much greater conviction is produced if one can also demonstrate the existence of such an idea, older than the one to be explained, and capable of being its originating cause.

If the claims of several ideas have to be considered, we

[1] 'Le bouddhisme et les évangiles canoniques," *Rev. bibl.*, 1906, 365; cp. 357.

must not follow the common practice of deciding in favour of the one that is simply the closest at hand, but we must ask what idea could most readily influence Christianity (or Judaism). However, as the same arguments would have to be urged again and again, it will be better at this point in our introduction to inquire once for all what religions or what philosophic views deserve our consideration.

3. The Presuppositions of Religious-historical Interpretation.

Among the religions that may possibly have influenced Christianity in its earliest form, we must, of course, first name those with which the religion of Israel in its subsequent career, *i.e.* after its institution by Moses, was brought in contact. That there was such contact; however, during the sojourn of the tribes of Israel in the wilderness, is not very probable. The tablets found at Tell el Amarna contain, in Babylonian characters and language, the correspondence of the Pharaohs Amenophis III. and IV. with Babylonian, Assyrian, Mesopotamian, and Cyprian kings, and with the Pharaohs' vassals in Canaan: and we know from this that for centuries previously the Babylonians must have been predominant in Western Asia. More particularly, these clay-tablets contain also Babylonian myths, which have manifestly been studied in Egypt; and as there is mention made of Ishtar being sent from Nineveh to Thebes, we may suppose that there were other instances also at that time of the spread of religious ideas from East to West. Still it remains rather improbable that at a subsequent time, and before the end of the sojourn in the Wilderness, these views influenced the religion of the tribes of Israel, no matter whether they are the Chabiri of the tablets or not. And, further, the indigenous population of Canaan with which Israel then came in contact had, as Stade[1] tells us, not been Babylonized to any great extent; accordingly, in spite of Gunkel,[2] the view can "not be accepted that the knowledge of Babylonian

[1] *Biblische Theologie des A.T.s*, i., 1905, 52 f.
[2] *Genesis* (1901), [2]1902, 65, 114.

myths and usages of worship was communicated to Israel through this medium in the period following the immigration." The first religion with which Israel became connected was no other than that of the inhabitants of Canaan.

And this religion in all likelihood really influenced Israel. For Israel did not extirpate or expel that indigenous population, as was afterwards believed, but settled in its midst, and entered into relations of *commercium* and *connubium* with it. It was therefore a matter of course, according to ancient ideas, that the new settlers should join in the religious rites which they found in Canaan: even the prophets (Hos 2^{17} 9^{10}, Jer $2^{2ff.}$) have not forgotten that Israel remained true to Jahweh only so long as it was in the Wilderness. Subsequently, under Solomon and the Omrids, other cults also were introduced; and although this statement applies primarily to the Kingdom of the Ten Tribes, which was of no importance for the later development, it is possible that such ideas may have been kept alive even in Judah till after the reforms of Josiah. Let us inquire what these ideas may have been.

Unfortunately we must at this point declare with Tiele:[1] "The indigenous sources for our knowledge of the Semitic religions of Western Asia . . . are scanty, of little significance for the history of religion, and for the most part belong to a later period. They are nearly all epigraphic in character, and for this reason have very slight importance, especially for mythology. . . . Apart from the inscriptions, some figures on monuments and coins deserve consideration, but the majority of these date from a time when Hellenism had essentially modified the native traditions." Even the work of Sanchuniathon, which Philo Herennius of Byblus is alleged to have drawn upon in the time of Hadrian, is, if not entirely fictitious, still not much older that Philo himself, and so has little value for us. And in the same way in regard to the Phoenician traditions, which Philo certainly knows, we have always to ask first of all whether they are as old as we require.[2] Some ideas that we en-

[1] *Geschichte der Religion im Altertum*, German trans. by Gehrich, i., 1896, 219 f.

[2] Cp. Baudissin, art. "Sanchuniathon," *Prot. Realencykl.*[3] xvii., 1906, 452 ff.

counter in our own day are undoubtedly of the earliest antiquity: thus, one may in certain circumstances appeal even to the primitive Semitic religion of to-day, as it is sketched for us by Curtiss.[1]

In the eighth century, Israel became subject to the Assyrians, who destroyed the Northern Kingdom in 722: before the same fate overtook Judah, it was for a time a vassal of the Egyptians. Even before this vassalage, Egyptian religion may possibly have influenced Judaism directly or through the medium of the Phoenicians, but the last opportunity for this was probably in the period just named. Accordingly we have now to ask ourselves what (in the second place) we know regarding genuinely Egyptian ideas.

For our knowledge of these the native sources are of most account, while the reports of the Greeks and of Manetho are only second-rate evidences. But even for the indigenous sources one must distinguish between the different periods. 'Undoubtedly," says Tiele,[2] "no people surpassed the Egyptians in conservatism. What was once established, was held in the utmost reverence. But not only were new additions continually made; we have also convincing proofs to show that the sacred records were altogether differently interpreted at different periods." And one must, I think, bear this in mind even for the restoration which was consummated in 663, when the twenty-sixth dynasty succeeded to power[3]—an event, therefore, that falls within the period in which Egyptian religion could for the last time have influenced the religion of Israel.

That Assyrian cults (in the third place) were at the same time introduced, is a fact of which we are expressly informed (Jer $7^{30f.}$ 32^{29}, Zeph 1^{5}); in view of the ideas then current it was perfectly natural. "The syncretistic movement," says Stade,[4] "brought the piety of Israel into accord with the international situation, which, viewed from the stand-

[1] *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, 1902; German under the title *Ursemitische Religion*, 1903.

[2] *Geschichte*, i. 30.

[3] In regard to this, cp. *ibid.* 108 ff.; Lange in Chantepie de la Saussaye' *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, i. (1887), [3]1905, 244 f.

[4] *Theologie*, i. 236.

point of orthodox Jahwism, was quite incomprehensible. It is through syncretism that religious feeling, which was so much discomposed by subjection to the Assyrian yoke, regains its calm." Josiah, no doubt, abolished these foreign cults; but they and the ideas connected with them may still have been secretly kept alive; in fact, they meet us afresh during the Exile, at any rate in individual cases (Ezk $13^{17ff.}$ $14^{1ff.}$). The presence among the Jews, even after this date, of designations that recall the names of Babylonian divinities, may or may not be a token of this: but it was obviously much more possible for such ideas to gain a hold now, when the people lived entirely amid these surroundings.

The chief authority for our knowledge of Assyro-Babylonian religion is, of course, the cuneiform inscriptions: in addition to them, and more important than Herodotus, who is only to be used with caution, there are also the fragments of Berosus, a contemporary of Alexander and his first successors, who as priest of Bel had access to the Temple Library, and the fragments of Diodorus Siculus and Nicolaus Damascenus, both of whom lived in the time of Julius Caesar and Augustus. It is true that these are primarily evidences for a later time; and in other ways also we have to distinguish between different periods. But there is no doubt that the later kings, who are particularly important for us, revived the ideas of previous times: the last independent king of Babylon, Nabunaid, devoted his thought exclusively to ancient traditions and institutions; and at the time when Cyrus was marching against his capital, he was directing a costly search for the lost titles relating to certain temple-endowments.[1] Nor did the Babylonian religion then disappear: "we can almost prove this," says Anz,[2] "from the cuneiform inscriptions alone: those found in the most recent decades have brought us always closer to the beginning of our era. . . . Even in the time of Strabo (*Geogr.* xvi. 1. 6, 739) and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* vi. 30) there

[1] Cp. Tiele, *Geschichte*, i. 141 f., 203 ff.

[2] "Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus," *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, xv. 4, 1897, 59 ff.

were in Babylonia three schools of priests, at Sippar, Uruk, and Babel-Borsippa, which were strongly opposed to each other in their astrological views. And even in the second century after Christ we become acquainted with a novelist Iamblichus, a Syrian by birth, who is said to have studied the wisdom and language of Babylonia in Babylon." So Babylonian religion may have influenced Judaism, and all the more because the national religions till then prevailing had, as E. Meyer[1] shows, been rendered at once individual and universal by the establishment of the Persian and Greek world-empire. But more important than all else, a new, a fourth, religion now came within the Jews' range of vision, that of the Persian conquerors.

That this religion was Mazdeism, is a view that has been questioned by other scholars, and most recently by Cumont;[2] but Tiele[3] has in my judgment proved that there are good grounds for adhering to this opinion. It is true that Cyrus, on the cylinder found in Babylon, allows himself to be represented as the man whom Marduk has called to be the deliverer of his people, who fears Marduk as his god, and who expresses the hope that the gods whom he has brought back to their dwelling, will daily implore Bel and Nabû on his behalf for length of days. But that was possible even for a worshipper of Mazda, who regarded Mithras and the Yazatas as standing alongside of Ahura, and who identified these with the Babylonian divinities. In fact, if Cyrus had not been such a man as this, Deutero-Isaiah (45[1ff.]) could not have designated him as the called and the favourite of Jahweh: the further circumstance that, according to the uniform testimony of antiquity, he was buried in Pasargadae, the city of the Magi, points to the same conclusion.

Again, Cambyses left no Persian or Babylonian inscriptions, but according to Egyptian epigraphs he was a loyal

[1] *Geschichte des Altertums*, iii., 1901, 168 f.

[2] *Textes*, i. 4 ff.

[3] *Geschichte*, ii., 1903, 371 ff. These conflicting views are reconciled by A. V. Williams Jackson in Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, ii., 1896–1904, 625, 628, 688; and by L. H. Gray, "The Religion of the Achaemenian Kings," *Journal of the Amer. Or. Soc.*, 1901, xxi. 2. 177 ff.

and humble servant of the gods of that country. In spite of this he may have been a worshipper of Mazda: "what the Egyptian priests choose to say of him in public records, or put into his mouth, is no more a proof to the contrary than what was ascribed to his father in Babylon disproves the father's Mazdeism."[1]

If, finally, even the later Achaemenids occasionally sacrificed to other gods, or at any rate spared their temples, this was chiefly, I think, for political reasons, or because of superstitious fear of those gods, sometimes out of sympathy for a god whom they identified with their own. That they reverenced Ahura Mazda before all others, they themselves continually declare: nor do they see in him a Nature-god, but a moral Being. And if alongside of him there appear still other deities, Mithras and Anâhita (from the time of Artaxerxes Mnemon), one must always bear in mind that in the Avesta also the Yazatas stand alongside of Ahura, and among them Mithras and Anâhita occupy the foremost places. "That Ahriman is not named in the inscriptions of ancient Persia," says A. V. Williams Jackson,[2] "is no more astonishing than that the devil is not named in a royal edict or presidential proclamation of to-day." And Tiele[3] says: "The marked repugnance against lying and deception, to which Darius traces all wickedness, especially all opposition to his authority, and every insurrection, and his advice that one should always follow the straight path, are characteristically Avestan and Zarathustrian." Even when Darius says of himself: "Then have I rebuilt the âyadanâs which Gaumâta the Magian had destroyed," *i.e.* when he assumes the existence of temples, which were at that time unknown to the Persians, we must think of the abodes of the sacred fire that were open only to the priests, abodes that must have existed in rugged and rainy Iran. And if, finally, we hear of tombs of the Achaemenids, although corpses were generally thrown to birds and dogs, still their bones may ultimately have been buried: or the Achaemenids were in this matter (and perhaps in some others) not really orthodox

[1] Tiele, *Geschichte*, ii. 380. [2] *Grundriss*, ii. 628.
[3] *Geschichte*, ii. 385.

Mazdeans. But in general, as Tiele[1] justly remarks, they deserved this name better than many a Byzantine emperor deserved the name of Christian. The author of the Platonic Dialogue *The First Alcibiades* is therefore warranted in stating (121 E f.) that among the Persians the children of royal descent were reared in the Magism of Zoroaster.

The other reports of the Greeks concerning the religion of the Persians are certainly to some extent untrustworthy or late. Herodotus (i. 131) regards "Mitra" as a goddess of whom the Persians had learned from the Arabians and Assyrians, and whom the Assyrians called Mylitta, the Arabians Alitta or Alilat; he has therefore probably confused the God with Anâhita. Also his concluding remark (140): *οἱ δὲ δὴ Μάγοι αὐτοχειρίῃ πάντα πλὴν κυνὸς καὶ ἀνθρώπου κτείνουσι, καὶ ἀγώνισμα μέγα τοῦτο ποιεῦνται, κτείνοντες ὁμοίως μύρμηκάς τε καὶ ὄφις καὶ τἆλλα ἑρπετὰ καὶ πετεινά* —is not exact, but proves "that although the Greek author does not speak of Ahriman and his evil spirits, and seems to be unacquainted with the dualism of the Persians as a doctrine, still the observances to which this dualism gave rise have not escaped his notice."[2] According to Diogenes Laertius (*Vita Philos.*, prooem. 6), Eudoxus, the contemporary of Plato, and Aristotle knew the doctrine of the struggle between Zeus-Ormazdes and Hades-Areimanios. In the fourth century, too, Theopompus wrote his Philippica, to which Plutarch refers in his description of Zoroastrian teaching (*De Is.* 46 f.). The later writers we need hardly consider.

From the notices of the earlier authorities, however, it must be inferred that the religion of the Avesta cannot have arisen, as Darmesteter[3] maintained, only in the Christian era under the influence of Hellenistic philosophy, particularly that of Philo. If Cumont[4] appeals, in support of this view, to the statement of Basilius the Great (*Ep.* 258 *ad Epiph.*, ed. Migne, xxxii. 954), that the Magi in Cappadocia never used religious books, he himself, on the other hand,

[1] *Geschichte*, ii. 403. [2] *Ibid.* 368.
[3] "Le Zend-Avesta," iii., *Annales du Musée Guimet*, xxiv., 1893, li. ff.
[4] *Textes*, i. 4, n. 2.

cites Pausanias (*Descr. Graec.* v. 27. 5) to prove that in the Lydian temples of Anâhita liturgical books were commonly to be found. And, above all, Cumont himself[1] says that the Cappadocian calendar came into existence about 400 B.C.: but in it there already appear the Fravashis and Amesha Spentas.[2] Further, Jackson[3] shows that we find names even in the Achaemenid period which are compounds of the names of the Amesha Spentas. Finally, Strabo (*Geogr.* xi. 8. 3, 512, xv. 3. 15, 733) knows, if not Ameretât, at any rate Vohu Manô;[4] it is therefore for these reasons impossible that the religion of the Avesta can have arisen only since the time of Christ.

Other reasons may be added. "If the Avesta," says Tiele,[5] "is subsequent in date to the beginning of our era, it is one of the strangest and most artful literary forgeries that have ever been devised. One of the most artful: for its authors have selected a language that was no longer spoken and no longer understood by the people as a whole, a language of which all the documentary evidence had been lost. The passages which they wished to be regarded as the most ancient, they have even written in an older dialect. They have with consummate art so represented the religion, which was their own invention, that in the songs (which were considered as old) it is living and active; in the writings that were ostensibly of a later date, it is bound by strict regulations; finally, it is contaminated by all sorts of foreign elements. In short, they have fabricated not only religious records, but a whole religious development, and taken pains that the history of the language which they employed should keep pace with it. They have carefully avoided everything that could be regarded as an allusion to their own time, have named no names but those belonging to a mythical antiquity, and have not once betrayed themselves. One of the strangest of forgeries: for this work of deception was within a few years generally accepted; the creations of this second-hand Theosophy became at once national gods, and

[1] *Textes*, ii., 1896, 6.
[2] Cp. *ibid.* i. 132 f.
[3] *Grundriss*, ii. 634 f.
[4] Cp. Cumont, *Textes*, i. 130 f.
[5] *Geschichte*, ii. 47 f.

immediately thereafter were recognized by native and foreign princes; and in the schools where these works had their rise, they were unable during that very period to produce anything but an extremely inadequate translation, with a commentary which not infrequently quite obscured the sense." Such a forgery is, in fact, impossible.

The actual date of the Avesta is a matter on which scholars have, no doubt, held widely divergent views. At all events the oldest parts are the Gâthas (*Yasna* 28–34, 43–51, 53), the Yasna Haptanghâiti (*Ysn.* 35. 3–41. 6) and some other portions from the same book, as also the metrical parts of the Yasts.[1] Of the Pahlavi literature, the Dînkard dates only from the ninth century, but gives in the eighth and particularly in the ninth book copious extracts from the lost parts of the Sassanian Avesta or rather of their translations in Pahlavi, so that one can still make use of it where it agrees with the old texts. Moreover, while the Bundahis does not belong to an earlier period than this, it probably furnishes us with a translation of the Dâmdâd Nask, one of the lost books of the old Avesta, and may therefore very properly be cited with caution. On the other hand, the Bahman Yast, even in what Bousset[2] accepts as its source, as well as the Maînôg-î Khirad, goes back only to the sixth century, and is accordingly negligible for our purposes. But even after the time of Alexander the Great, Parsism may have influenced Judaism and Christianity; and, further, from that time one or both of these were exposed to Greek influences, and Christianity later on to Roman influences as well.

Greek religion (in the fifth place) possesses, in contrast with the religions last discussed, what Holwerda[3] describes as an elusive Protean nature: there were hardly any prescriptions of dogma or ritual that were recognized all over the Greek world or embodied in writing. "Thus there is no great

[1] Cp. Geldner in Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss*, ii. 25 ff.; Stave, *Einfluss*, 38 ff.; also Moffatt, *Hibb. Journ.*, 1902–3, i. 765 f.

[2] "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Eschatologie," *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, 1900, 120 f.

[3] In Chantepie de la Saussaye's *Lehrbuch*, ii. (1889), [3]1905, 237.

opportunity of being informed by the Greeks themselves regarding the nature of their religious feelings and ideas. We have, as it were, to overhear these secrets in incidental remarks about religion and worship that occur in works of quite a different character." Now it was evident that the older ideas from the fifth century onwards were in process of dissolution. Thucydides "made human destinies depend solely on man, and traced out their causes and connexion without taking account of divine influences. Even the oracles were in his eyes often deceitful, and only occasionally did their responses come true."[1] It is Euripides, above all, who shows what uncertainty reigned in his time; for though he looked for solace in Orphism, the last word of his muse was resignation.

And all this (in the sixth place) influenced the Romans as well: their religion also, when they came into contact with Judaism and Christianity, presented a picture of utter ruin. "The most important priestly offices, those of a pontifex, augur, or decemvir, had no longer any appreciable significance for religious life. . . . Several priesthoods had ceased to exist; others, like those of the fratres arvales and sodales Titii, had even passed into oblivion. . . . The time-honoured office of a flamen Dialis remained vacant for seventy-five years. Certain cults, even the sacra privata, were neglected. Many sanctuaries fell in ruins. It was only in the games that any remarkable interest was still shown: the number of days which they occupied increased fivefold during the last two centuries of the Republic."[2] Even the reforms of Augustus made very little difference: the old faith certainly continued to exist, especially in the provinces: but even there it was always losing ground before the advancing tide of Emperor-worship.[3] And if this worship was partly a development of Oriental ideas, in other ways also Oriental religions (our seventh division) were always extending their influence westward.

"Before the time of Alexander, only a few foreign cults

[1] Chantepie de la Saussaye's *Lehrbuch*, ii. 387.
[2] *Ibid.* 479.
[3] Cp. also Wendland in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum N.T.* i. 2, 1907, 93.

had found an entrance into Greece. Dionysus had brought other Thracian and Phrygian gods in his train: *e.g.* Cybele, who as early as the fifth century was assimilated to the Athenian mother of the gods, Bendis, Cotys, Sabazius. Adonis and the Semitic Aphrodite, Ammon and Isis, were worshipped in Athens and in other towns."[1] In later times, however, it was these last cults that made the greatest conquests, over an area that extended as far as Rome, although their success was greater in every other part than in Greece proper, where there were indigenous mysteries enough.[2] And this is especially true of Mithraism, which had already spread as far as the Eastern parts of Asia Minor in the time of the Achaemenids, but even under the Diadochi had not been propagated farther. It was probably through the pirates whom Pompey defeated that it first gained a wider allegiance. We do not know when it reached Tarsus, the religion of which was originally Semitic: Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* xxxiii. 45) does not mention it, but names only Perseus, who was perhaps here as elsewhere worshipped as the ancestor of the Persians. At any rate, the worship of Mithras, to speak generally, was never diffused through the Graeco-Roman world, in which subsequently it could not even hold its own. "Dans tous les pays que baigne la mer Égée," says Cumont,[3] noting a fact which has hardly been sufficiently considered until now, "une dédicace tardive du Pirée rappelle seule son existence, et l'on chercherait en vain son nom parmi ceux des nombreuses divinités exotiques adorées à Délos au IIe siècle avant notre ère. Sous l'empire, on trouve, il est vrai, des mithréums établis dans certains ports de la côte de Phénicie et d'Égypte, près d'Aradus, à Sidon, à Alexandrie; mais ces monuments isolés font ressortir d'avantage l'absence de tout vestige des mystères dans l'intérieur du pays. La découverte récente d'un temple de Mithra à Memphis paraît être l'exception qui confirme la règle, car le génie mazdéen ne s'est probablement introduit dans cette

[1] Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 77.

[2] Cp. Cumont, *Les religions orientales*, 261, n. 21.

[3] *Textes*, i. 241 ff.; cp. also Harnack, *Die Mission u. Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 1902, 534 ff. [Eng. trans., *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, 1905, ii. 447 ff.].

antique cité que sous les Romains. Il n'est mentionné jusqu' ici dans aucune inscription d'Égypte ou de Syrie, et rien ne prouve qu'on lui ait élevé des autels même dans la capitale des Séleucides. . . . L'onomatologie grecque, qui fournit une série de noms théophores rappelant la vogue dont jouirent les divinités phrygiennes et égyptiennes, ne peut opposer aux Ménophile et aux Métrodote, aux Isidore et aux Sérapion, aucun Mithrion, Mithroclès, Mithrodore ou Mithrophile. Tous les dérivés de Mithra sont de formation barbare.[1] Alors que la Bendis thrace, la Cybèle asianique, le Sérapis des Alexandrins, même les Baals syriens étaient accueillis successivement avec faveur dans les villes de la Grèce, celle-ci ne se montra jamais hospitalière pour le dieu tutélaire de ses anciens ennemis.

"Le plateau central de l'Asie Mineure, qui fut longtemps rebelle à la civilisation hellénique, resta encore plus étranger à la culture romaine. A la vérité, la Cilicie avait été constituée en province romaine depuis 102 a. J.-C., mais on n'occupa à cette époque que quelques points de la côte, et la conquête du pays ne fut complétée que près de deux siècles plus tard. La Cappadoce fut incorporée seulement sous Tibère, l'ouest du Pont sous Néron, la Commagène et la petite Arménie définitivement sous Vespasien. Alors seulement s'établirent des relations suivies et immédiates entre les contrées reculées et l'Occident. . . . Suivant Plutarque (*Vita Pomp.* 24), il est vrai, Mithra se serait introduit beaucoup plus tôt en Italie. Les Romains auraient été initiés à ses mystères par les pirates ciliciens vaincus par Pompée. Ce renseignement n'a rein d'invraisemblable. . . . Mais confondu dans la foule des confréries qui pratiquaient des rites étrangers, le petit groupe de ses adorateurs n'attira pas l'attention. Le yazata participait au mépris dont étaient l'objet les Asiatiques qui le vénéraient. L'action de ses sectateurs sur la masse de la population était à peu près aussi nulle que celle des sociétés bouddhiques dans l'Europe moderne.

"Différents faits concourent à prouver cette longue obscurité. . . . Strabon (*Geogr.* xv. 3. 13, 732) et Quinte-Curce (*Hist. Alex.* iv. 13. 48) ne parlent encore de Mithra que comme

[1] In regard to this, cp., further, Cumont, *Textes*, i. 45 f.

d'un dieu des Perses. Aucun autre auteur du siècle d'Auguste ne dit un mot de lui, et à Pompéï, où tant de monuments des cultes égyptiens ont été mis au jour, on n' a rien trouvé qui rappelât Mithra. Les plus anciens auteurs qui le nomment, voient encore en lui un étranger (cf. Stat. *Theb.* i. 719 s.) Plutarque (*l.c.*) place ses mystères sur le même rang que les pratiques barbares des Ciliciens (il n'eut point parlé ainsi d'Isis), et au milieu du IIe siècle, Lucien (*Deor. Conc.* 9, *Jup. Trag.* 8) s'exprime encore avec un dédain analogue." Origen's judgment (*Contra Cels.* vi. 22), as Dieterich[1] thinks, may have to be somewhat differently understood: still when all is said, it is *a priori* very improbable that the worship of Mithras should have in any way influenced Judaism or primitive Christianity.[2]

Further, in the eighth place, Greek philosophy may have influenced both of these. We may note that in the strange woman from whom, according to Pr $2^{16f.}$, Wisdom is to deliver a man, "the stranger which flattereth with her words, which forsaketh the guide of her youth and forgetteth the covenant of her God," Sellin[3] (who follows M. Friedländer[4]) sees the knowledge and culture that have been introduced from abroad; and he finds that this culture is presupposed also in the Book of Sirach. The *κρυπτά* (נִסְתָּרוֹת), with which men are warned not to busy themselves (Sir 3^{22}), might in fact be interpreted as erroneous speculations, and particularly as Greek philosophy: the Talmud takes the passage thus. But if that were so, foreign culture would not be expected of a wise man in $39^{2ff.}$. On the other hand, in the New Testament one may look for the influences of Greek philosophy especially in Paul, who came from Tarsus, at that time one of the chief centres of philosophical study: for though he certainly possessed no Greek learning, still he and other Christian writers are likely to have come in contact with contemporary philosophy. And that philosophy was

[1] *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (1903), [2]1910, 88.

[2] Cp. also Fries, "Was bedeutet der Fürst der Welt in Joh. 12^{31} 14^{30} 16^{11}?" *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1905, 169.

[3] *Die Spuren griechischer Philosophie im A.T.*, 1905, 9, 15, 18.

[4] *Griechische Philosophie im A.T.*, 1904, 68 ff.

above all Stoicism, in the form which it had latterly assumed under Platonic influences: in comparison with it other tendencies are only of secondary importance.

Greek philosophy was closely associated (in the ninth place) with the various religions of the time, even with the Egyptian. For that Egyptian religion influenced the Hermetic writings, as Granger[1] and Reitzenstein[2] maintain, is not improbable, Zielinski[3] notwithstanding. Further, we must remark that this Hermetic literature is in its beginnings certainly earlier than has generally been supposed[4]—though it is not nearly so old as Flinders Petrie[5] has recently maintained. In particular, the introduction to the Mandata of Hermas (*Vis.* 5) reminds one of the introduction to the Poimandres in a way that, in spite of Bousset's[6] judgment, can hardly be accidental. "The decisive point," says Reitzenstein[7] justly, "is not that the revealing spirit comes unrecognized to the musing prophet, is asked who he is, and is then transformed; not that he assures the prophet that he always is, and always will remain, beside him; but that he represents himself in the pagan author as the shepherd of men, in the Christian as the shepherd of this definite man." For so it is in fact: the angel not only appears in the figure of a shepherd, but calls himself by that name. That he plays another rôle, and that accordingly his saying: "*I will dwell with thee for the remaining days of thy life*," has another meaning than in the Poimandres, does not disprove a connexion between the two writings: a connexion and, in fact, an indebtedness on Hermas' part may be inferred from the difference of the two in their use of the transformation motif. "In the Christian author this is nothing but an unmeaning masquerade; in the pagan it is a matter of course that the

[1] "The Poemandres of Hermes Trismegistus," *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, 1904, 395 ff.

[2] *Poimandres*, 1904.

[3] "Hermes u. die Hermetik," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1905, 321 ff., 1906, 25 ff.

[4] A different view is held only by Aall, *Der Logos*, ii., 1899, 78, n. 4, but he offers no proofs.

[5] "Historic References in Hermetic Writings," *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, 1908, i. 224 f.; *Personal Religion in Egypt*, 1909, 38 ff., 85 ff.

[6] *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1905, 694.

[7] *Poimandres*, 12.

νοῦς, which is the Light, should reassume its cosmic mode of manifestation."[1] Further, when Hermas, who at other times has visions at Rome or Cumae, is conducted (*Sim.* 9. 1. 4) to a mountain in Arcadia, this is to be explained by the Arcadian origin of Hermes; indeed, even the two names Hermas and Hermes are perhaps connected. At all events the two writings, as Lietzmann[2] also decides, are related to one another, and the Shepherd, though not directly dependent on the Poimandres, is dependent on its source. This being so, we can occasionally make use of the Poimandres to explain the New Testament as well.

Lastly (in the tenth place), writings or systems that are Christian, or at any rate influenced by Christianity, may themselves be much later than the New Testament, and yet may often contain ideas which are earlier than it, and which may possibly have influenced it if they were present in its *milieu*. Among these may be named not only the Gnostic systems and Manichaeism, but also Mandaeism, whose sacred writings (and fragments of these are still extant) date at the earliest from the time of the Sassanids. If Kessler's[3] view were correct, that the term Jordan, employed in them for any flowing water, was derived from the river in Palestine, one might agree with him in the conclusion that in earlier times the Mandaeans actually lived on the bank of the Jordan: but Brandt[4] holds, on the contrary, that the Old Testament term הַיַּרְדֵּן is only a generic name with the article, which appears as such also in Job 40^{23}. Still, we may suppose that the Mandaeans were at one time much more widely spread to the West, and therefore, if they are so early in any form at all, they may possibly have influenced Judaism and Christianity.

On the other hand, it is *a priori* unlikely that Indian religions, and particularly Buddhism, have influenced these two systems. Seydel,[5] van den Bergh van Eysinga,[6] and Drews have, I admit, pointed to many specific connexions between India

[1] *Poimandres*, 13.
[2] *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1905, 202.
[3] Art. "Mandäer," *Prot. Realencykl.*[3] xii., 1903, 181.
[4] *Die mandäische Religion*, 1889, 66, n. 2.
[5] *Evangelium*, 305 ff.; *Buddha-Legende*, 46 ff.
[6] *Einflüsse*, 88 ff.

and Greece, and shown that in various ways there was active commercial intercourse between the two countries. But that this served as a medium to convey Indian ideas to the West—we are not concerned at present with India's spiritual *importations*—is hardly demonstrable.[1] The animal stories already alluded to on p. 19 are perhaps the one exception. Moreover, "Buddhism," says Zeller,[2] "was so entirely outside the Western range of vision, that in the whole of Greek and Roman literature it is mentioned by only one known writer in the first two centuries after Alexander, and in the following four centuries by only a few others. About the beginning of the third century before Christ, Megasthenes in his *Ἰνδικά* gave an account not only of the Brahmans but also of the Buddhists, or, as he calls them, the *Σαρμᾶνες*, with whom he had become acquainted in Palimbothra when he was envoy of Seleucus Nicator at the court of *K*andragupta (*Σανδράκοττος*). In the first half of the first century before Christ, they were mentioned by Alexander Polyhistor, the learned compiler, who appears to have followed an earlier source than Megasthenes' *Ἰνδικά*, since he did not call them, like that author, *Σαρμᾶνες* (Sanskrit *S*rama*n*a), but *Σαμαναῖοι* (Pali Samana). . . . Extracts from Megasthenes' account were given by Strabo (xv. 1. 59, 712 C), to whom we owe our knowledge of it"; Strabo, however, at the same time laments the meagreness of the accounts of India. Again, Asoka's statement that he had sent missionaries to various Greek kings, friends of Antiochus II. of Bactria, deserves not a particle of credit. "There is no outside evidence," says Hopkins,[3] "that such missionaries ever arrived, or, if they did, that they ever had any influence; and scholars like M. Senart . . . incline to the opinion that Açoka had simply heard of these kings through his friend Antiochus, and had dispatched missionaries to them, when he boasted of the conversion of the Western world (within a year after the missionaries were sent). . . .

[1] Cp. Hardy, *Der Buddhismus nach älteren Pâli-Werken*, 1890, 112 ff.

[2] "Zur Vorgeschichte des Christentums," *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1899, 209 f.

[3] *India*, 123 f.

Up to the present no trace of any early Buddhistic worship has been found in the West. The only known monument, a reputed Gnostic tomb in Syracuse, is only supposed to have been Buddhistic—two suppositions in regard to a monument of comparatively late date." And yet, since Buddhism from the second century onward becomes better known, it may have exerted some influence even before that time—by way of Turkestan—always assuming that the traditions concerned are of as early a date.

Seydel,[1] in his proof of this, starts from Asoka's edict engraved on the rock in Byrath near Bhabra, in which Asoka, according to Kern's translation, says: "All that our Lord Buddha has declared, Sirs, is well declared, therefore he must also, Sirs, be regarded as an indisputable authority: then will the true faith long endure. Animated by this thought, Sirs, I now present to you the following religious works: Summary of Discipline (Vinaya), The Supernatural Powers of the Master, Fears of the Future, The Hermit's Song, On Asceticism, The Questions of Upatishya, and The Address to Râhula, concerning Mendacity, delivered by Buddha our Lord." Following Weber, he sees the Hermit's song in the Dhammapada, which is thought by others as well to be of an early date, as also is the Sutta-Nipâta which quotes it, the Mahâ-parinibbâna-Sutta, Mahâ-vagga, *K*ulla-vagga, Kara*nd*avyûha, Ma*ggh*ima-Nikâya, Sa*m*yutta-Nikâya, Pa*ṭ*isambhidâ-maggo, and Buddhava*m*sa. The work "On Asceticism" he identifies with fragments of the Mahâ-vagga; but even if this identification is doubtful, the writings mentioned remain certainly pre-Christian.

That this is also true of the Abhinishkrama*n*a-Sûtra, the Buddha-*k*arita-Kâvya of Asvaghosha, and the Lalita Vistara,[2] Seydel attempts to demonstrate particularly from the Chinese catalogues of Buddhist literature. According to these the Lalita Vistara was translated into Chinese soon after 63 A.D., but probably in an older form, which may be the basis also of the other works just named, but which

[1] *Evangelium*, 47 ff.; *Buddha-Legende*, 55 ff.

[2] According to Seydel's *later* view, at any rate, these three works were produced in this order.

cannot be reconstructed. So, too, the proofs formerly given for the greater antiquity of the Lalita Vistara and the other writings do not hold good of their present form: they must not therefore be cited off-hand as pre-Christian.[1] Further, Kanishka, whose counsellor was the traditional author of the Buddha-*ka*rita-Kâvya, probably lived as late as the second half of the first century of our era;[2] and to suppose not only that this author was earlier, but also that he was writing long before this, is hardly possible. The date of the Nidânakathâ, Divyâvadâna, the Avadânas and *G*aina Sûtras is also uncertain. Again, the Sûtra that deals with the story of the *Kândâ*la maiden can be shown to exist in a Chinese translation only in the time of the Han dynasty (25–220 A.D.), the Lotus of the Good Law in the time of the Tsin dynasty (265–316); and although it may contain older materials, they cannot be identified.[3] Further, the *G*âtakas belong to the fifth century: it is only some of them that can be shown to be earlier. But one must not say with van den Bergh van Eysinga:[4] "Still the prefaces, which inform us of the occasions on which Buddha narrated these stories, certainly go back in substance to pre-Christian times."

If there are similarities that cannot be accidental between this later Buddhist literature and the New Testament, the question would arise whether the former could not be dependent upon the latter. Seydel rejects this supposition on the ground that no elements of a foreign religion would have been introduced into the old canon, which was idolatrously reverenced: yet he himself continually supposes that the

[1] Cp. Rhys Davids, *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion*, 1888, 197: "As evidence of what early Buddhism actually was, it is of about the same value as some mediaeval poem would be of the real facts of the Gospel history."

[2] Cp. Seydel, *Buddha-Legende*, 74. But Pischel in Hinneberg's *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, i. 7, 1906, 200, *Leben und Lehre des Buddha*, 1906, 18, assigns him to the middle of the first century B.C.

[3] Cp. Hopkins, *India*, 135: "It is quite justifiable to suppose that the origin of the Lotus may be some centuries earlier; but it is quite as unhistorical to refer legends of our present Lotus to a pre-Christian era as it would be to put the history of Herodotus into the eighth century because some of his stories may have had a more antique form."

[4] *Einflüsse*, 53.

Buddhist writings were re-edited. And now Hopkins[1]—who is perhaps occasionally a little too credulous of tradition—shows that Christianity penetrated to India very early. "We know . . . that Pantaenus was expressly sent to teach the Brahmans in India, and found a Christian church already established there in 190 A.D.;[2] that in the sixth century there was in South India a Christian church, which, according to its own tradition, had been founded in the first century; that Christian influence was perhaps strong enough in the North-west to leave Christian scenes depicted in the Peshawar and Kandahar sculptures of the fifth century; that in the seventh century, missionaries were in middle India; and that about the same century they were sent to China, where, indeed, as in Tibet, it is probable that they had already been located for some time." And he remarks also:[3] "Far from being unchanging, all the Hindus, both Brahmans and Buddhists, were mentally most progressive and receptive. They have always taken new gods from outside their own pale, and have always been prone to assimilate the thoughts and traditions of those with whom they have come in contact, especially in religious matters."

This is also to be borne in mind for the relation of Krishnaism to Christianity. Krishnaism can be recognized in the Mahâbhârata, which in its present form is placed by Hopkins[4]

[1] *India*, 141; cp. also Hardy, *Buddhismus*, 111.

[2] With reference to Chrysostom's statement, *Hom. in Joh.* 2. 2 (ed. Migne, lix. 32): ἀλλὰ καὶ Σύροι καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ Ἰνδοὶ καὶ Πέρσαι καὶ Αἰθίοπες καὶ μύρια ἕτερα ἔθνη εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν μεταβαλόντες γλῶτταν τὰ παρὰ τούτου δόγματα εἰσαχθέντα ἔμαθον ἄνθρωποι βάρβαροι φιλοσοφεῖν, Lorinser, it is true, says (*Die Bhagavad Gîta*, 1869, 268): "One might be tempted to regard the significance of this evidence as weakened by the addition καὶ μύρια ἕτερα ἔθνη: but this consideration loses its force if one remembers that all the translations here mentioned, with the single exception of the Indian one, can be traced in other ways as well, and that they have even been preserved till our day." But Tiele, "Christus en Krishna," *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1877, 71 f., says: "At all events, such an important circumstance as the existence of an Indian translation of the New Testament as early as the third century A.D., no trace of which has ever been found, must not be presumed on the strength of a more or less rhetorical outburst in a homily." In regard to the well-known legend of the island of the monotheists which Indians were said to have visited, cp. Tiele, *ibid.* 69 f.; Hopkins, *India*, 160 f.

[3] *Ibid.* 140.

[4] *Ibid.* 146.

within the century or the two centuries, by Winternitz[1] within the four centuries, that precede and follow the beginning of our era. Thus there may possibly have been a contact with Christianity; but for the reasons stated above it is probable that Krishnaism rather than Christianity was the borrower.[2]

The other religions that may possibly have influenced Christianity might now be examined successively, with a view to discovering whether and where they have actually done so. But this arrangement would involve the great disadvantage that many passages or ideas of the New Testament would have to be discussed more than once. It is better, therefore, to start with the New Testament itself, and first of all to examine those ideas that are common to primitive Christianity as a whole, and afterwards the others, which are to be found only in one or a few of its leading representatives. Under the former head I distinguish the ideas that were already present in Jewish thought, the new ideas, and, finally, the institutions of primitive Christianity; and I regard Jesus, Paul, and the Johannine circle as its leading representatives. Alongside of the preaching of Jesus, the Synoptists' own views will be discussed; then, before proceeding to Pauline theology, I shall examine the standpoint of the primitive Church, and at the same time discuss the other parts of the Acts of the Apostles. From Pauline to Johannine theology we can best pass by way of the post-Pauline writings, even if they are in some measure later than the Johannine. The whole may fitly be preceded by an examination of the attempts to trace Christian thought in general to foreign influences.

[1] *Geschichte der indischen Literatur*, i., 1908, 403.

[2] Cp. also Oldenberg, *Indien*, 20 f.

PART I.

A.—CHRISTIAN THOUGHT IN SOME OF ITS MORE GENERAL ASPECTS.

The attempt to explain the whole of Christianity by non-Jewish influences has been made only by B. Bauer, for in view of the observations on p. 3 f., Dupuis' work need not be further considered. Even the later author does not offer much more than hints or suggestions, but these are far more numerous than in the earlier. Bauer's thesis, like Steck's [1] similar one regarding Paulinism, is untenable, since it involves conclusions which critical scholarship cannot accept: nevertheless, "Roman Hellenism" may possibly have influenced the New Testament.[2] Even defenders of the essential trustworthiness of the Synoptic Gospels and the genuineness of the chief Pauline Epistles have often expressed this view, now incidentally, now as the basis of some comprehensive inquiry. Others have merely compared classical literature either with the New Testament as a whole, or with various books, sections, and passages in it: but even from this some-

[1] *Der Galaterbrief*, 1888, 376 f.: "'Roman Hellenism,' which (in the first place) was lifted above the ordinary thoughts and aspirations of paganism by the later Platonic philosophy, in the form in which Seneca maintained that system in Rome,—which (in the second place) had gained a knowledge of the doctrines of a purified Judaism from the Alexandrian Bible and the writings of Philo,—and which (thirdly), with or without the formality of proselytism, sympathized with Jewish monotheism and its purer ethics—'Roman Hellenism' became the cradle of the first Christian Church in the capital of the world."

[2] Cp. also Wendland, *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1895, 495: "In view of modern inquiries into the philosophic 'diatribe,' one may without the least fear raise the question whether even *primitive* Christian literature in its stylistic forms, in its ideas, and particularly in its comparisons, was in some degree influenced by this mode of thought and expression—not that that influence would necessarily be transmitted by the medium of literature."

thing may perhaps be gained for our subject. In fact, it is not impossible that the attempted proofs of the dependence of later Stoicism on Christianity may here and there be employed to prove the dependence of Christianity on Stoicism. Some of these inquiries, it is true, do not properly come under the heading given above, but it is perhaps best to exhibit them in a collected form at the very beginning.

As for details of method, I do not in the first instance specify particular ideas or groups of ideas that might be derived from Graeco-Roman philosophy—in the widest sense of that term—but within the parts of the New Testament just mentioned I take the passages *seriatim*, guided in the Synoptic Gospels by the earliest of them, the Gospel of Mark, discussing what is peculiar to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke (in this the order of their compilation) at the points where they have inserted it in Mark's account, and dealing with the other books according to their chronological order. Where I encounter an idea common to the whole of the New Testament, or, at any rate, one that may be met at other points, I at once deal with these additional passages: if, again, an idea is ultimately derived not from Graeco-Roman philosophy, but from a different source, I leave it for the moment entirely on one side.

That this philosophy should have influenced the preaching of Jesus or even the subsequent evangelical tradition, will, I think, seem to most people highly improbable. Harnack [1] rightly lays stress on the fact that "the whole Synoptic tradition belongs to Palestine and Jerusalem, and has had no connexion with Gentile-Christian circles except in the redaction of Luke. The limits of the play of Hellenic influence in the Gospels, in so far as that influence had not already infected the very blood of Judaism, are thus sharply defined." Something, however, might have passed into Christianity in this way: it is, in fact, possible that not only Luke or Mark, but even Matthew and the author of the Discourse-document (if this was originally written in Greek), occasionally followed Greek models. Let us therefore study, first of all,

[1] *Lukas, der Arzt*, 1906, 118 [Eng. trans., *Luke the Physician*, 1907, 166 f.].

the Synoptic writers and their possible dependence on such influences, which need not, in fact, have been transmitted by a literary medium, but may have affected them and the circles from which they sprang, merely through the spiritual atmosphere of the time.

To begin our detailed examination—Zahn [1] would derive the *ἀπονοήθητι* of Epictetus (*Diss.* ii. 16. 41) from the preaching of *μετάνοια* with which Jesus, like the Baptist, opened His ministry: one might also by the reverse process trace the form of this preaching to Stoicism, which in general did teach the doctrine. But, as Wrede [2] shows, the Evangelists no longer understood the term in its etymological signification, but in the sense of repentance. Here then it cannot even be said that the notions are identical. And it is surely clear that the change of mind which John and Jesus actually desired does not need to be derived from Greek philosophy.

Wetstein,[3] always the most exhaustive investigator in such fields of inquiry, cites numerous parallels to the Beatitudes, but does not fail to note that mercifulness was condemned by the earlier Stoics. As for the expression in Lk 14^{35} "*the savourless salt is not fit for the dunghill,*" the parallel in Epictetus (*Diss.* ii. 4. 4 f.), which Jülicher [4] compares, and which in Zahn's [5] opinion has been borrowed from Luke, is altogether general in its nature.

Of the contrast drawn between the old and the new law in Mt $5^{21ff.}$, B. Bauer [6] says: "The timbers for this building were prepared by Seneca, who, by one application after another, sought to show the inexhaustible character of his new conception of the law's requirements." And then he cites various passages from *Epist.* xv. 3 (95) which (as elsewhere) I quote in their original form: "*Faciet quod oportet monitus, concedo*: SED ID PARUM EST, *quoniam quidem non in facto laus est, sed in eo, quemadmodum fiat* (40). *Audiat licet, quem modum servare in sacrificiis debeat, quam procul*

[1] *Der Stoiker Epiktet u. sein Verhältnis zum Christentum* (1895), [2]1895, 39.
[2] "Miszellen," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1900, 66 ff.
[3] *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, 1751, i. 286 ff.
[4] *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, ii., 1899, 69.
[5] *Epiktet*, 43.
[6] *Christus u. die Cäsaren*, 48 f.

resilire a molestis superstitionibus: NUMQUAM SATIS PROFECTUM ERIT, *nisi qualem debet deum mente conceperit, omnia habentem, omnia tribuentem, beneficum gratis* (48). *Ecce altera quaestio, quomodo hominibus sit utendum. Quid agimus? Quae damus praecepta? Ut parcamus sanguini humano?* QUANTULUM EST *ei non nocere, cui debeas prodesse!* MAGNA SCILICET LAUS EST, *si homo mansuetus homini est* (51)." But the resemblance to the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew's Gospel is far too slight to warrant us in tracing it to Seneca, or any model that Seneca may have followed.

Again, to explain the condemnation of the lustful look in Mt 5^{28}, there is no need of the parallels in Greek and Latin cited by Wetstein [1] and Wendland [2]—nor even of the reference to Job 31^{1}, which otherwise is much more apposite. The saying that follows, regarding the removal of the offending eye and hand, is probably, as the duplicate in Mk $9^{43ff.}$, Mt $18^{8f.}$ shows, to be understood in the more general sense: thus the passages quoted by Wetstein [3] are again inappropriate. Nor can these words, or the saying addressed to the rich young man in Mk 10^{21} and par., be based upon Seneca's exhortation (*Ep.* ii. 5 [17]. 1) quoted by B. Bauer: [4] "*Proice omnia ista, si sapis, immo ut sapias, et ad bonam mentem magno cursu ac totis viribus tende. Si quid est, quo teneris, aut expedi aut incide.*"

From the prohibition of oath-taking in Mt 5^{34}, which recurs in Ja 5^{12}, Zahn [5] would derive the corresponding expression in Epictetus (*Ench.* 33. 5); Wendland [6] shows that the idea already occurs in Seneca, the philosopher Eusebius, and Philo; while Bonhöffer [7] regards it as possible that the later Stoics borrowed it from the Pythagoreans. The Pythagoreans are often represented as having had a special influence on the Essenes, who, according to the authentic [8] and generally

[1] *Nov. Test.* i. 301.

[2] *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1895, 495, and in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum N.T.* i. 2, 1907, 53, n. 3.

[3] *Nov. Test.* i. 302 f.

[4] *Christus*, 49 f.

[5] *Epiktet*, 29, 43 f.

[6] *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1895, 494.

[7] *Die Ethik des Stoikers Epiktet*, 1894, 113.

[8] Cp. Wendland, "Jahresbericht über die nacharistotel. Philosophie der Griechen, 1887–1890," *Arch. f. Gesch. d. Phil.*, 1892, 225 ff.

trustworthy accounts of Philo (*Quod Omnis Prob. Lib.*, ed. Mangey, ii. 458) and Josephus (*BJ* ii. 8. 6, *Ant.* xv. 10. 4), likewise condemned the oath. But such a connexion in this matter is not demonstrable—not even from *Clem. Hom., Contest.* 2. 4, where the formula of adjuration has certainly rather a Greek sound. Still that formula does not necessarily come from Essenism:[1] and the Essenes' repugnance to the oath may reasonably be traced to Jewish thought, in which many similar expressions are to be found.[2] And it is there, if anywhere, that we have to look for the origin of the Christian ideas on the subject.

For the disapproval of retaliation, Mt $5^{39ff.}$ (cp. also 1 Co 6^{7}), there are certainly numerous parallels in later Stoicism, as again Bonhöffer,[3] Heinrici,[4] and E. Klostermann [5] show. Yet the first of these authorities emphasizes at the same time the fact "that in their strength and warmth, as well as in their potency, these ideas are far behind the New Testament." "Further, it is undeniable that the idea of love for one's fellow-men, in the depth and purity with which it meets us in Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius, had not yet come to life in the earlier Stoa." However, when he goes on: "But its seeds and germs were present in the Stoic system from the first: the men who with all their energy championed, as against Epicureanism, a moral interpretation of the idea of God, and emphasized in it in particular the elements of goodness and loving solicitude, were bound to shape their moral ideal accordingly"—we must not neglect a notable difference. "If the Stoic speaks of a God and Father of all," remarks Heinrici [6] justly, "he understands by that the cohesive principle that unites all creatures to one another: he expresses in this way his consciousness of

[1] For the opposite view, see Zeller, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Christentums," *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1899, 217 ff.

[2] The most exhaustive treatment of this subject is to be found in Spitta, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur des Urchristentums*, ii., 1896, 142.

[3] *Die Ethik des Stoikers Epiktet*, 101, 105 f.

[4] "Die Bergpredigt begriffsgeschichtlich untersucht," *Lpz. Reformationsprogramm*, 1905, 46 ff.

[5] In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, ii. 1, 1909, 193 f.

[6] *Bergpredigt*, 54 f.

belonging to the whole." For Jesus, on the other hand, God is really the loving *Father* of all His creatures: accordingly even the exhortation, v.[48] "*Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect*"—though its wording may have been influenced by Greek philosophy, since in Luke 'merciful' replaces 'perfect,' and the latter term is used nowhere else in the New Testament as an attribute of God[1]—has not the same meaning as, for example, the well-known words of Seneca (*Ep.* xv. 3 [95]. 50): "*Vis deos propitiare? Bonus esto. Satis illos coluit, quisquis imitatus est.*"

Too much stress, again, is laid by O. Holtzmann[2] on the similarity between the Greek idea of God and Jesus' idea—a similarity which this scholar attributes to the dependence of the latter on the former. He believes that we can interpret the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Piece of Silver, and the Prodigal Son, in Luke 15, in this way, that one must believe of God also that He does not allow His property to be lost: but, in fact, these parables are only intended to vindicate, in the face of any objections, His love for sinners, which is, generally speaking, a certainty apart from that. Also the saying in Mt 7[11] "*If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?*" (cp. Lk 11[13])—is not intended to prove God's love for the first time, but only to establish it in the presence of doubt. And how could Jesus believe that "every man has to expect from his God what he himself adheres to as his ideal in practice"? The petition, "*Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors*" (Mt 6[12], Lk 11[4]), and other similar sayings, are not based "on the judgment that what a man regards in his conscience as right, he believes of his God," but *vice versa*: what a man believes of his God, he regards also in his conscience as right. Jesus does not believe on God because He wills the good, but He wills the good because

[1] Bonhöffer's objections (*Epiktet u. das N. T.*, 1911, 89) to this argument do not appear to me conclusive, however grateful I am to him otherwise for having so fully discussed my position with regard to the relationship between Stoicism and the New Testament.

[2] *Neutestamentl. Zeitgeschichte*, 1895, 225 ff. In the second edition (1906) this detailed discussion, which was in fact irrelevant, is omitted.

He believes on God: God is for Him the idea of the good, not *vice versa*. In that case, however, His idea of God does not suggest the Platonic idea so strongly that one would be bound here "to note how Jewish thought (almost unconsciously, we may admit) has borrowed out of [*aus*] Hellenism" —to say nothing of the fact that this idea of God was not at all so prominent in Jewish thought.

So, too, when O. Holtzmann goes on to say: "Precisely as . . . Paul," 2 Co $3^{18ff.}$, "sees in Christ the revelation of God, Plato in the *Phaedrus* (249 D ff.) regards the Beautiful as the clearest and purest revelation of the Eternal in the world. And precisely as Paul declares that we in beholding this picture are always more and more transformed into likeness with it, Plato says that the contemplation of the Beautiful fits us to aspire after resemblance to God"— we must point out that the agreement is not very close. Indeed, Paul does not here at all designate Christ as the revelation of God: and God appears as a model for our imitation only in Eph 5^{1}, that is to say, in a non-Pauline Epistle.

On the other hand, the passages finally quoted by O. Holtzmann, Ja $1^{13.\ 17}$, 1 P 2^{9}, 2 P $1^{3f.}$, are quite irrelevant to the present discussion. In the first, God is only described as untempted and the Father of lights; there is nothing said of His being our example. In the second, the context, and the passage Is $43^{20f.}$, which is here drawn upon, prove that the excellencies of God, which we are to show forth, must be His glorious achievements.[1] According to the third passage, we are to become partakers of the divine nature—that is certainly a *terminus technicus* of philosophy—by the precious and exceeding great promises which the glory and virtue of God have granted unto us. But in 1 Jn 1^{7} we read again that we must walk in the light as He is in the light, and in 1 Jn 4^{8} "*He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love.*" In the Fourth Gospel also (1^{18}) Christ is called the revealer of God: but again nothing of all this is specifically Greek. Accordingly the influence which O. Holtzmann

[1] Cp. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 1895, 91 ff. [Eng. trans., *Bible Studies* (1901), ^{2}1909, 96 f.].

declares to have been exerted by Hellenism on the Christian religion, or on the Jewish religion before it (as he hastily supposes), has not been proved in reference to this first point.

Wetstein[1] adduces many parallels from Greek and Roman philosophers to the condemnation of external devoutness in Mt 6; Heinrici[2] quotes in particular the proud characterization which Euphrates gives of himself (Epict. *Diss.* iv. 8. 17): *ἐπὶ πολὺ ἐπειρώμην λανθάνειν φιλοσοφῶν καὶ ἦν μοι τοῦτο ὠφέλιμον. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ᾔδειν, ὅσα καλῶς ἐποίουν ὅτι οὐ διὰ τοὺς θεατὰς ἐποίουν, ἀλλὰ δι' ἐμαυτόν· ἤσθιον ἐμαυτῷ καλῶς, κατεσταλμένον εἶχον τὸ βλέμμα, τὸν περίπατον· πάντα ἐμαυτῷ καὶ θεῷ.* "But in the last words," he continues, "the difference of the motivation stands out clearly. The disciple of Jesus does not put himself alongside of God, but comes to God as the child to his father. For that reason he guides his actions exclusively by the thought of God, where and when he can serve God. But whatever is a matter between God and him, is not a matter for men's judgment." So it is quite inconceivable that the New Testament passage owes anything to philosophy. And even for Mt 6[8] "*Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him*"—there is no need to suppose any indebtedness, although here the parallels really correspond.

In reference to the logion regarding the laying up of treasures in Mt 6[19ff.], Lk 12[33f.], Heinrici[3] says: "The general truth of the image is one of the favourite ideas of ancient popular philosophy. Epictetus says: *ὅπου γὰρ ἂν τὸ ἐγὼ καὶ τὸ ἐμόν, ἐκεῖ ἀνάγκη ῥέπειν τὸ ζῷον· εἰ ἐν σαρκί, ἐκεῖ τὸ κυριεῦον εἶναι· εἰ ἐν προαιρέσει, ἐκεῖ εἶναι· εἰ ἐν τοῖς ἐκτός, ἐκεῖ* (ii. 22. 19). Plutarch puts the matter still more graphically: *ὅτι δὲ ἕκαστος ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ τῆς εὐθυμίας καὶ τῆς δυσθυμίας ἔχει ταμεῖα, . . . αἱ διαφοραὶ τῶν παθῶν δηλοῦσιν* (*De Tranq. Anim.* 14). With special reference to wealth, Socrates (Xen. *Mem.* iv. 2. 9) declares that wisdom is more valuable than treasures of silver and gold (*ἀργυρίου*

[1] *Nov. Test.* i. 317 ff.; cp. also E. Klostermann in Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, ii. 1. 197.

[2] *Bergpredigt*, 63 f.

[3] *Ibid.* 70 f.

καὶ χρυσίου θησαυροί). This is worked out in detail in *Cyrop.* viii. 2. 21, where Cyrus compares his wealth with that of Croesus. But these and many similar sayings are distinguished from the logion in the Sermon on the Mount by the nature of the contrast drawn. In the former case, wisdom, friendship, the riches of the inner life are set over against the possession of money and property: and in the almost ascetic restriction which they put upon their wants, the Cynics furnish the practical commentary to these ideas. But in the Sermon on the Mount the earthly and the heavenly are contrasted, as they are in the parable of the Rich Fool, which concludes thus: οὕτως ὁ θησαυρίζων ἑαυτῷ καὶ μὴ εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν (Lk $12^{16ff.}$)." Here also, then, there is certainly no borrowing.

Again, in reference to the words regarding the service of two masters, Mt 6^{24}, Lk 16^{13}, Jülicher [1] remarks: "The protest against a non-committal policy in fundamental questions of morality was made also in Greek philosophy; cp. Epict. *Enchir.* 13 and *Diss.* iv. 2, particularly § 4 [for that, and not § 2, is the correct reference]: οὐδεὶς ἐπαμφοτερίζων δύναται προκόψαι ἀλλ' . . . εἰ πρὸς τούτῳ μόνῳ θέλεις εἶναι . . . ἄφες ἅπαντα τἆλλα: further, § 10: οὐ δύνασαι καὶ Θερσίτην ὑποκρίνασθαι καὶ Ἀγαμέμνονα. To make this protest, and by the contrast of God and Mammon to avow so weightily and at the same time so sublimely the indivisible unity of the religious and the ethical ideal, were possible only for a man who in his service of God had advanced so far that everything connected with Mammon was in his eyes scarcely ἐλάχιστον (Lk $16^{10ff.}$)."

With the warning which follows in Matthew's Gospel against un-Christian anxiety (cp. Lk $12^{22f.}$) some scholars are particularly eager to compare Epictetus' censure (*Diss.* i. 9. 19): ὅταν χορτασθῆτε σήμερον, κάθησθε κλάοντες περὶ τῆς αὔριον, πόθεν φάγητε: but, as Heinrici [2] justly remarks, "when Epictetus proceeds: ἂν μὴ σχῇς, ἐξελεύσῃ· ἤνοικται ἡ θύρα, the sanction thus given to suicide reveals the broad gulf between the Stoic-Cynic view of life and the Christian." The reference to the birds of the air (Luke speaks of the

[1] *Gleichnisreden*, ii. 115. [2] *Bergpredigt*, 75.

ravens) makes one think of Stoicism, but no more requires to be derived from it (as O. Holtzmann [1] derives it) than the similar saying in Mt $10^{29f.}$, Lk $12^{6f.}$; the thought arises, in fact, from Jesus' new conception of God, and the illustration employed would be much more fittingly traced to the Old Testament (Job 38^{41}, Ps 147^{9}). The parallels to Mt 6^{34} "*Be not anxious for the morrow*," which Wetstein [2] in particular quotes, are based on other presuppositions, and are therefore negligible.

So also the correspondences to the logia regarding judgment, Mt $7^{1ff.}$, do not indicate dependence: and if there were dependence, one would think more readily of the parallels from Rabbinical literature. The same remark applies to the parallels quoted for Lk 6^{39} "*Can the blind guide the blind? Shall they not both fall into a pit?*" Heinrici [3] adduces many passages similar in import to Mt 7^{6} "*Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine.*" "Dog" and "sow" were a familiar combination in antiquity, and particularly among the Greeks and Romans; and this fact has determined the form of expression here, as it has also suggested the "proverb" of 2 P 2^{22} "*The dog that turns to its own vomit again, and the sow that washes itself*" (so we must probably translate) "*by wallowing in the mire*" (λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου). These last words, as Wendland [4] shows, are based upon an apophthegm of Heraclitus, which, like the well-known quotations from the Greek poets (1 Co $15^{32f.}$, Ac 17^{28}, Tit 1^{12}), has, of course, reached the New Testament writer by oral transmission, and which probably ran thus: ὗες δὲ ἥδιον βορβόρῳ λούονται ἢ διαγεῖ [or διειδεῖ] καὶ καθαρῷ ὕδατι. "One must not object that it is so natural to speak of the sow in the mire that the writer may have hit upon this phrase himself. For the most natural expression, which is found in sayings where there is no connexion necessarily with Heraclitus, would be κυλίεσθαι and κυλινδεῖσθαι, not λούεσθαι. The choice of this word, as we have seen, is

[1] *Zeitgeschichte*, 229. [2] *Nov. Test.* i. 337. [3] *Bergpredigt*, 82 f.
[4] "Ein Wort des Heraklit im N.T.," *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1898, 788 ff.

determined by the original phraseology and context of the sentence from Heraclitus. And surely it is a decisive argument that the author clearly indicates that he is following some original, and the original that we have found agrees with his quotation as closely as we have any right to expect."[1]

The saying in Mt 7^{7}, Lk 11^{9} "*Seek, and ye shall find,*" is, as finally Henrici[2] shows, proverbial among the Greeks, but is, of course, not necessarily borrowed from them. Also for Mt 7^{12}, Lk 6^{31} "*All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them,*" there are parallels that are real and not merely apparent, unlike those from the earlier Rabbis, whom Jesus may be thought to have outbidden; but, in fact, Jesus was the first who stated this principle in downright earnest. And though the Two Ways are described above all by the Greeks in the manner of Mt $7^{13f.}$, Lk $13^{23f.}$—Cebes speaks (*Tab.* 1. 2 f.) at the same time of a door—still the Greek uses this as an illustration of Virtue and Vice, Jesus of Life and Destruction. But it remains possible, for the Discourse-document at any rate, that there has been some borrowing of ideas, such as certainly took place at a later time:[3] and this remark applies also to the saying in Mt 7^{16} (Lk 6^{44}) "*Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?*" with which we may at once associate Ja 3^{12} "*Can a fig tree yield olives, or a vine figs?*" The fact that in the Old Testament, thorns and thistles on the one hand, fig trees, olive trees, and vines on the other, are named together, does not explain these references in the New Testament: they have their closest parallels in Greek and Roman literature, as quoted by Wetstein,[4] Heinrici,[5] and E. Klostermann.[6] But the passages adduced by the second of these writers in illustration of Mt 7^{21}, Lk 6^{46} "*Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven,*"

[1] "Ein Wort des Heraklit im N.T.," *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1898, 792 f.

[2] *Bergpredigt*, 84.

[3] Cp. Dieterich, *Nekyia*, 1893, 191 f.

[4] *Nov. Test.* i. 343.

[5] *Bergpredigt*, 91.

[6] In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, ii. 1. 209.

are neither very similar nor in any way necessary for the elucidation of that saying.

The idea contained in Mk 2^{17} and par.: "*They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick*"—has been expressed by many others, particularly by Diogenes (Dio Chrys. *Or.* viii. 5). Sonny [1] thinks that the aphorism passed from the Cynics to the Christians; and Jülicher [2] comes to the following conclusion: "It may be that Cynic itinerant preachers helped to naturalize this idea in Palestine as well, although it was such an obvious one that different men may quite well have stumbled upon it independently. Yet a comparison of the saying of Jesus with the parable in Dio will illustrate all the more clearly the distinctiveness of Jesus' conception of His mission. Jesus speaks not of the prudent man, but of Himself; not of the unwise, but of sinners; not of His coming for the purpose of rebuke and correction, but tenderly of His calling men."

Wetstein [3] cites various parallels to Mk $3^{24f.}$ and par. "*If a kingdom or house is divided against itself, it cannot stand*"; but Mark need not be indebted to such foreign models. Zahn [4] supposes that the designation of the traditionalists as *νεκροί* in Epict. *Diss.* i. 13. 5, and the admonitions of ii. 19. 15 f.: *δείκνυε πῶς εἴωθας ἐν πλοίῳ χειμάζεσθαι. Μέμνησαι ταύτης τῆς διαιρέσεως, ὅταν ψοφήσῃ τὸ ἱστίον καὶ ἀνακραυγάσῃς, ἄν τίς σοι κακόσχολος πῶς παραστὰς εἴπῃ 'λέγε μοι τοὺς θεούς σοι ἃ πρώην ἔλεγες· μή τι κακία ἐστὶ τὸ ναναγῆσαι, μή τι κακίας μετέχον;' οὐκ ἄρας ξύλον ἐνσείσεις αὐτῷ; 'τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, ἄνθρωπε; ἀπολλύμεθα καὶ σὺ ἐλθὼν παίζεις'*—are an indistinct reminiscence of Mt $8^{22ff.}$ or the parallel accounts; it is unlikely that one will reverse the order and regard the former passages as (indirectly) the model of the latter. The words in Lk 4^{23} "*Physician, heal thyself*," have no parallel in Greek or Roman literature that corresponds so closely as that in Tanḥumah (4. 2), which, no doubt, is a very late Jewish work. Or has the parable in that work also been borrowed? That is not impossible.

[1] *Ad Dionem Chrysostomum Analecta*, 1896, 180.
[2] *Gleichnisreden*, ii. 177.
[3] *Nov. Test.* i. 391.
[4] *Epiktet*, 43.

With Mt 11[16f.] "*This generation is like unto children sitting in the market-places, which call unto their fellows, and say, We piped unto you, and ye did not dance; we wailed, and ye did not mourn*," Wendland[1] compares Epictetus, *Diss.* i. 29. 31: *τοῖς παιδίοις, ὅταν προσελθόντα κροτῇ καὶ λέγῃ 'σήμερον Σατορνάλια ἀγαθά,' λέγομεν 'οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθὰ ταῦτα'; οὐδαμῶς· ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπικροτοῦμεν.* But this is no more apposite than the passage quoted by Jülicher[2] (i. 24. 20): *μὴ γίνου τῶν παίδων δειλότερος, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκεῖνα, ὅταν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἀρέσκῃ τὸ πρᾶγμα, λέγει 'οὐκέτι παίξω,' καὶ σύ, ὅταν σοι φαίνηταί τινα εἶναι τοιαῦτα, εἰπὼν 'οὐκέτι παίξω' ἀπαλλάσσου, μένων δὲ μὴ θρήνει*—or even than iii. 15. 5: *ὅρα ὅτι ὡς τὰ παιδία ἀναστραφήσῃ, ἃ νῦν μὲν ἀθλητὰς παίζει, νῦν δὲ μονομάχους, νῦν δὲ σαλπίζει, εἶτα τραγῳδεῖ ὅ τι ἂν ἴδῃ καὶ θαυμάσῃ.* It is to be remarked, further, that "danced" and "mourned" in Aramaic give a play upon words, and therefore the saying is undoubtedly native to Palestinian soil.

As a parallel to Mt 12[36] "*Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment*," Wetstein[3] quotes the maxim of Pythagoras preserved by Stobaeus (*Anthol.* iii. 34. 11, ed. Hense, i. 684): *αἱρετώτερόν σοι ἔστω λίθον εἰκῇ βάλλειν, ἢ λόγον ἀργόν*: but it is, of course, intelligible without this. And still less do I believe —though Jülicher[4] regards it as possible—that the word "mouth" in the logion in Mt 15[11. 17] regarding the things that defile a man, is a reminiscence of a passage in Plato, which Philo (*De Opif. Mundi*, 40. 119, ed. Mangey, i. 29) quotes in this form: *στόματι, δι' οὗ γίνεται θνητῶν μέν, ὡς ἔφη Πλάτων, εἴσοδος, ἔξοδος δ' ἀφθάρτων. Ἐπεισέρχεται μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ σιτία καὶ ποτά, φθαρτοῦ σώματος φθαρταὶ τροφαί, λόγοι δ' ἐξίασιν ἀθανάτου ψυχῆς ἀθάνατοι νόμοι, δι' ὧν ὁ λογικὸς βίος κυβερνᾶται.* The mention of the mouth was natural enough apart from this quotation.

The parable of the Sower, Mk 4[3ff.] and par., is in W. B. Smith's[5] opinion preserved in its original form in Hippolytus, *Philos.* v. 5, and to be understood as the Naassenes afterwards

[1] *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1895, 495, and in Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 53, n. 3.
[2] *Gleichnisreden*, ii. 27.
[3] *Nov. Test.* i. 394.
[4] *Gleichnisreden*, ii. 62.
[5] *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, 1906, 107 ff.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC

interpreted it, namely, of the "seeds sown by 'the unportrayable' in the Cosmos"—which might be connected with the Logoi of Greek philosophy. But that this is not necessarily the original sense is deducible from the fact that the Naassenes at the same time draw upon a passage from the First Epistle to the Corinthians (10^{11}): they seem therefore to have taken the parable from the Gospels as well, and only subsequently to have explained it in the totally unnatural sense given above. Smith, however, is right thus far, that the comparison of the word with seed in 1 P 1^{23}, Ja 1^{21} and probably also the statement of 1 Jn 3^{9} "*Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him*," may possibly go back not only to the parable of the Sower, but also to the philosophic doctrine of the λόγος σπερματικός.

With the announcement of Jesus' resurrection after three days, or on the third day, and Peter's protest, Mk $8^{31f.}$ and par., Spiess [1] compares the colloquy between Socrates and Crito in Plato's dialogue of that name (44 A, B): ἐδόκει τίς μοι γυνὴ προσελθοῦσα, καλὴ καὶ εὐειδής, λευκὰ ἱμάτια ἔχουσα, καλέσαι με καὶ εἰπεῖν· ὦ Σώκρατες, ἤματί κεν τριτάτῳ Φθίην ἐρίβωλον ἵκοιο . . . ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐμοὶ πείθου καὶ σώθητι. We shall, however, find on a later page that the historicity of the Gospel tradition on this point cannot be questioned. Also the words of Mk 8^{36} and par., "*What doth it profit a man, to gain the whole world, and forfeit his life?*"—are not taken from Greek literature, where similar expressions are often found: they are too much in harmony with Jesus' whole demeanour, a feature of the Gospel narrative that is certainly historical.

In Mt 19^{12} "*There are eunuchs, which made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake*," there is probably no condemnation of marriage; and still less in the view expressed in Mk 12^{25} "*When they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as angels in heaven.*" Yet we may fittingly at this point bring together the New Testament passages where marriage is, in fact, regarded as ethically inferior to celibacy: they are 1 Co 7 and Rev 14^{4}; in 1 Ti 2^{15} 4^{3} this view is controverted, but in $3^{2.\ 12}$ 5^{9} and

[1] *Logos Spermaticós*, 38.

Tit 1[6] a second marriage for the clergy, at any rate, is disapproved; and probably for the same reason also, in Lk 2[36], emphasis is laid on Anna's one marriage. Scholars are again remarkably eager to refer these ascetic ideas to Essenism, in which, generally speaking, they certainly prevailed,[1] and finally to Pythagoreanism, from which Essenism is often said to be largely derived. But, in the first place, the requirement of celibacy is not proved for Pythagoreanism:[2] it may well come from Judaism, in which there are other evidences of its existence.[3] "For since the act of marriage as such made one unclean and necessitated a Levitical bath of purification, the effort to attain to the highest possible degree of purity and holiness might well lead to the entire rejection of marriage."[4] Still less do the other distinctive features of Essenic life suggest an origin in Pythagoreanism, which was, in fact, directly opposed to daily ablutions. One is therefore compelled to give up entirely this view of the origin of the Essenes,[5] widespread though it is at present; and even if it could be maintained, the ascetic tendencies of early Christianity (which had otherwise little in common with Essenism) would not yet be explained. It would be a sounder course, in Paul's case at any rate, to trace them partially to Stoic influences. For when he says in 1 Co 7[29] "*The time is shortened: henceforth let those that have wives be as though they had none*," a similar expression may be quoted from Epictetus (*Diss.* iii. 22. 69): τοιαύτης δ' οὔσης καταστάσεως, οἵα νῦν ἐστιν, ὡς ἐν παρατάξει, μή ποτ' ἀπερίσπαστον εἶναι δεῖ τὸν Κυνικὸν ὅλον πρὸς τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐπιφοιτᾶν ἀνθρώποις δυνάμενον, οὐ προσδεδεμένον καθήκουσιν ἰδιωτικοῖς οὐδ' ἐμπεπλεγμένον σχέσεσιν κτλ.: and Epictetus may here give us a clue to the opinions of earlier Stoics. Zahn,[6] Lightfoot,[7]

[1] For fuller details, cp. O. Holtzmann, *Zeitgeschichte*[2], 216.

[2] Cp. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (1852), [3]1881, 145 f.

[3] Cp. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentl. Zeitalter* (1905), [2]1906, 493, n. 1.

[4] Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes* (1874), [3]ii., 1898, 578 f. [Eng. trans., *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, 1885–91, II. ii. 211 f.].

[5] So also Bousset, *Religion*, 527 ff.; Wendland in Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 106.

[6] *Epiktet*, 43.

[7] *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (1868), [6]1881, 316, n. 2.

Heinrici,[1] and J. Weiss [2] call attention also to the fact that in Paul (1 Co 7^{35}) the very word *ἀπερίσπαστος* (or its adverb) recurs; here then one is perhaps compelled—particularly in view of a point which we shall raise later—to suppose collateral influences from Stoicism. For the rest, however, Judaism sufficiently explains this attitude of primitive Christianity towards marriage, and even Paul's injunction in 1 Co 7^{5} "*Defraud ye not one the other, except it be by consent for a season, that ye may give yourselves unto prayer.*" At all events, this explanation is more natural than one which invokes the corresponding pagan ideas, to which Lietzmann [3] refers.

If in Lk 10^{42} we should have to follow ℵ B C^2 L in reading: *Μάρθα, Μάρθα, μεριμνᾷς καὶ θορυβάζῃ περὶ πολλά, ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἑνός*, and to think that *ὀλίγων*, at any rate, refers to *dishes*, we might compare, as Wetstein [4] does, the exhortations in Greek philosophy to simplicity of life. But though older than the ordinary reading, even that is probably not the original one:[5] in this matter, accordingly, there is no connexion to discuss. So also the similarity between the recommendation not to invite friends who could make a recompense, $14^{12ff.}$, and the passages cited by Wetstein,[6] is too unimportant. Again, the admonition to count the cost of following Jesus (v.$^{28ff.}$) too little resembles Epictetus' warning, which Jülicher [7] compares, against a hasty conversion to philosophy (*Diss.* iii. 15. 8 ff.). The same remark applies to the parable of the Unjust Steward (Lk $16^{1ff.}$), which enforces the necessity of prudence, and the sentence from that philosopher (*Diss.* i. 10. 1) cited by Bonhöffer:[8] *εἰ οὕτω σφοδρῶς συντετάμεθα περὶ τὸ ἔργον τὸ ἑαυτῶν ὡς οἱ ἐν Ῥώμῃ γέροντες περὶ ἃ ἐσπουδάκασι, τάχα ἄν τι ἠνύομεν καὶ αὐτοί.* One would more readily follow Zahn [9] in comparing

[1] "Der erste Brief an die Korinther," in Meyer's *Kommentar über das N.T.* v. (1839), ^{8}1896, 243.

[2] *Die christliche Freiheit nach der Verkündigung des Apostels Paulus*, 1902, 26.

[3] *Handbuch*, iii. 105.

[4] *Nov. Test.* i. 726.

[5] Cp. Merx, *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien*, ii. 2, 1905, 280 ff.; J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des N.T.s*, i. 1, 1906, 430.

[6] *Nov. Test.* i. 752.

[7] *Gleichnisreden*, ii. 214.

[8] *Ethik*, 18, 49.

[9] *Epiktet*, 43.

with Lk 16^{12} *εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ὑμέτερον τίς δώσει ὑμῖν*, the distinction so commonly drawn by Epictetus between external goods as *ἀλλότρια* and moral or spiritual goods as *ἴδια* (*ἡμέτερα, σά* κτλ.), *Ench.* 1. 2 f., *Diss.* ii. 6. 24, 15. 1, iii. 24. 3, iv. 1. 81, 5. 7; but this means only that the two writers have employed the same usage of speech, a point which has no further interest for us here. And even if in Mk 11^{27} and Jn 10^{23} Jesus were described like a Greek philosopher (as J. Weiss [1] supposes) who walks up and down as he teaches, one could hardly regard this as indicating dependence upon foreign influences.

The original of the "first commandment of all" (Mk $12^{29ff.}$ and par., cp. also Gal 5^{14}, Ro 13^{9}) B. Bauer [2] finds in the passage from Seneca, *Ep.* xv. 3 (95). 51 f.: "*Quando omnia, quae praestanda ac vitanda sunt, dicam, cum possim breviter hanc illi formulam humani officii tradere: omne hoc, quod vides, quo divina atque humana conclusa sunt, unum est: membra sumus corporis magni.*" But this feeling of organic unity is something very different from faith in the fatherly love of God and the sense of the consequent moral obligation.

The contrast between words and deeds in Mt 23^{3} is so natural that it is unnecessary to recall, with Heinrici,[3] similar passages in Epictetus (particularly *Diss.* iii. 24. 110): besides, there are many Rabbinical parallels. Finally, Lightfoot [4] and after him Zahn [5] compare with the parable of the Evil Servant (Mt $24^{48ff.}$, Lk $12^{45ff.}$) the declaration of the same Stoic (*Diss.* iii. 22. 3): *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν οἰκίᾳ καλῶς οἰκουμένῃ παρελθών τις αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ λέγει 'ἐμὲ δεῖ οἰκονόμον εἶναι.' εἰ δὲ μή, ἐπιστραφεὶς ὁ κύριος καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν σοβαρῶς διατασσόμενον, ἐλκύσας ἔτεμεν*: but again the wording is too general. Only in a few passages, therefore (Mt $7^{13f.\ 16}$, Mk 2^{17} and par., Lk 4^{28}), do the Synoptic Gospels come so close to Graeco-Roman philosophy that one can think of a real connexion between them, a connexion, I need hardly say, that owes nothing to the medium of literature. And even in these passages we have to do only with images or comparisons: the *matter* of

[1] *Die Schriften*, i. 1. 167.
[2] *Christus*, 49.
[3] *Bergpredigt*, 28.
[4] *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 315, n. 6.
[5] *Epiktet*, 43.

the discourses of Jesus, and even of later Christian preaching, is independent of philosophy.

In the Acts of the Apostles, B. Bauer[1] derives the saying of Peter: "*We must obey God rather than men*" (4[19] 5[29]) from Plato's *Apology* (29 D); "and just as the Athenian philosopher proceeds, '*Therefore so long as I breathe, I shall never cease to devote myself to philosophy*,' the disciples of the Christian Church also continue unflinchingly in their preaching after being threatened by the council." Yet this correspondence is not further remarkable; and even the principle stated in the first of these quotations may have been expressed independently by two or by several writers, as cited, *e.g.* most exhaustively by Wetstein.[2] On the other hand, the reproach that is cast upon Paul in Athens (Ac 17[18]), "*He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods*" (which is then explained by the reference to the preaching of "Jesus and the resurrection"), is actually, I think, borrowed from the story of Socrates.

The speech in v.[24ff.] was illustrated by Wetstein[3] by an ample array of quotations from Greek and Roman authors; and more recently Norden,[4] Geffcken,[5] and Lietzmann[6] trace it substantially to the popular philosophy of the time. This is in reality the source of the polemic (v.[24]) against the temple, which recurs in Jn 4[21] and Rev 21[22]—at any rate, it is the partial source; for, as 7[47ff.] shows especially, that polemic was derived in some measure from the Old Testament. In the same way the attack on idols in Ro 1[23. 25] is based primarily on the Book of Wisdom, and no doubt in part on the Old Testament, but in part also on Greek popular philosophy. It is of such philosophy that one is reminded when Paul says in v.[23] "*They changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things*," or in v.[25] "*They worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator*"; for Seneca, as quoted by Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, vi. 10, proceeds on the same lines: "*Sacros, immortales, inviolabilesque deos in materia vilissima*

[1] *Christus*, 59 f. [2] *Nov. Test.* ii. 478. [3] *Ibid.* ii. 568 ff.
[4] *Die antike Kunstprosa*, 1898, 475, n. 1.
[5] *Zwei griech. Apologeten*, 1907, xxxii. [6] *Handbuch*, iii. 9.

atque immobili dedicant; habitus illis hominum, ferarumque et piscium, quidam vero mixtos ex diversis corporibus induunt"—and as quoted by Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* ii. 2. 14: "*Simulacra deorum venerantur . . . et cum haec tanto opere suspiciant, fabros qui illa fecere contemnunt*" (cp. vi. 25. 3). Further, that God needs nothing, is literally the teaching of philosophers; and that He giveth to all life and breath and all things, that in Him we live and move and have our being—that is Stoicism, as far as the form is concerned; and so it is here illustrated by a quotation from Aratus, which only repeats a thought that already occurs in Cleanthes (*Hymn. in Jov.* 5). Feine [1] calls attention particularly to Epictetus, *Diss.* ii. 14. 27 (cp. also i. 13. 3), and compares with the similar words of Ro 11[36] ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, the thoroughly Stoic sentence in Philo (*De Vict. Off.*, ed. Mangey, ii. 242): ἤτοι ὡς ἓν τὰ πάντα ἢ ὅτι ἐξ ἑνός τε καὶ εἰς ἕν—but does not fail to observe the difference between this and the Christian idea of God.[2] Again, Curtius [3] declares that the idea that God has determined for the nations the bounds of their habitation, is unmistakably Greek; but against this Heinrici [4] conclusively adduces Dt 32[8]. All the more, however, the idea that men ought to seek God, expressed here and in 14[17] as well as in 1 Co 1[21], Ro 1[19f.] 2[14f.], comes ultimately from philosophy. In this last passage of all, where Paul speaks of the work of the law written in men's hearts, that is singularly clear, as Feine [5] in particular shows; and Norden,[6] with special reference to these words, justly points out that "this very idea passed into the general consciousness through the agency of the Stoa." It appears to me doubtful, on the other hand, whether the

[1] "Stoizismus u. Christentum," *Theol. Lit.-Blatt*, 1905, 73, 77.

[2] Wernle, *Die Anfänge unserer Religion* (1901), [2]1904, 128 [Eng. trans., *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1903–4, i. 182 f.], says less clearly: [Along with other features] "the definition of God as the Being of whom, through whom, and in whom all things are, proves that—albeit, of course, unconsciously—Paul had submitted to the purifying influence of Greek speculation upon Jewish thought."

[3] "Paulus in Athen," *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1893, 932.

[4] *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1894, 209.

[5] *Der Römerbrief*, 1903, 95 ff.; *Theol. Lit.-Blatt*, 1905, 78.

[6] *Kunstprosa*, 497, n. 1.

dictum, "*The times of ignorance God overlooked,*" is really, as Geffcken [1] maintains, intended to meet the Epicurean objection to a divine interference at a definite point of time; besides, it was only in reference to the creation of the world that this objection was entertained. But the fact remains that philosophy has in many points influenced the speech in Ac $17^{24ff.}$, though probably for the most part through the medium of Jewish apologetics.

With Paul's words in Ac 20^{24} "*I hold not my life of any account, as dear unto myself, so that I may accomplish my course, and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus,*" Spiess [2] compares some sayings from Plato (*Crito*, 48 B, 54 B, *Gorg.* 512 D, E) and Epictetus (*Diss.* ii. 6. 1). The saying of Jesus quoted in v.^{35} "*It is more blessed to give than to receive,*" is compared by Wetstein [3] and Heinrici [4] with an utterance of Epicurus which Plutarch has transmitted (*Philos. Esse Cum Princ.* 3. 778 C [Usener, *Epicurea*, 325]): *τοῦ εὖ πάσχειν τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν οὐ μόνον κάλλιον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἥδιον εἶναί φασιν.* But neither of the New Testament passages needs any such aid to make it fully intelligible.

Paul's statement in Gal 2^{4} regarding the Judaizers, that they had come in privily to spy out his liberty and the liberty of his churches, is neither in its matter nor its expression further remarkable. But it is noticeable that so often elsewhere in this and the later Epistles ($4^{23f.\ 26.\ 30f.}$ $5^{1.\ 13}$, 1 Co 7^{39} $9^{1.\ 19}$ 10^{29}, 2 Co 3^{17}, Ro 6^{20} 7^{3} 8^{2}), even in contexts where the reader is unprepared for it, he speaks of his freedom from the law and from other obligations, and this always in the same words. Heinrici,[5] J. Weiss,[6] and Feine [7] are probably right, therefore, in supposing that he is here partially influenced by the Stoic doctrine of the Wise Man, though J. Weiss traces to that doctrine much more than it really contains. All that can be said is that Paul speaks elsewhere of *ἐλευθερία* and *ἐλευθεροῦν* in reference to sin and corruption (Ro $6^{18.\ 22}$ 8^{21}), and that this is partially accounted for by the predilection which he derived from

[1] *Apologeten*, xxxii.
[2] *Logos*, 200.
[3] *Nov. Test.* ii. 600.
[4] *Bergpredigt*, 4.
[5] *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1894, 209 f.
[6] *Die christliche Freiheit.*
[7] *Theol. Lit.-Blatt*, 1905, 79.

Stoicism for this term. For the circumstance that freedom has a very different basis with the Stoics and with Paul is no reason why he should not partially—one must always repeat this qualification—be indebted in his phraseology to Stoicism, which had such a pre-eminent influence at Tarsus.

Steck[1] compares with Gal 2^{20} "*I have been crucified with Christ*" (cp. 5^{24} 6^{14}, Ro 6^{6}), Seneca, *De Vita Beata*, 19: "*hi qui in se ipsos animadvertunt, quot cupiditatibus, tot crucibus distrahuntur*"; but these two passages have only one idea in common. And the resemblance (which is also noted by O. Pfleiderer[2]) between Gal 3^{27}, Ro 13^{14}, where the Apostle speaks of "putting on Christ," and Seneca's exhortation, *Ep.* vii. 5 (67). 12: "*induc magni viri animum et ab opinionibus volgi secede paulisper*," is one of expression only.

There is greater cause for recognizing with Feine[3] the influence of Stoicism in the principle stated in Gal 3^{28} "*There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female*" (cp. Col 3^{11}), although Paul's Christian ideas were certain of themselves to lead him to such a view. Still he has not drawn from this the complete logical conclusion for the relation of man and woman (1 Co $11^{3ff.}$, $14^{34f.}$); consequently his enunciation of the principle may have been partially due to another influence. On the other hand, it is obviously out of the question to suppose, with J. E. B. Mayor,[4] that it was formulated in opposition to the alleged saying of Plato (Plut. *Vita Mar.* 46. 1) that "he thanked his daemon because he had permitted him to be a human being, a man, a Greek, and a contemporary of Socrates." Further, Seneca's words (which Steck[5] quotes) contained in *Ep.* xv. 3 (95). 47: "*accendere aliquem lucernas sabbatis prohibeamus*," are so distant a parallel to the disapproval of Jewish times of observance in Gal $4^{9f.}$ (cp. Col 2^{16}) that it is idle to suppose that Paul has borrowed from the Stoic.

[1] *Galaterbrief*, 256 f.

[2] *Das Urchristentum* (1887), ²1902, i. 41 [Eng. trans., *Primitive Christianity*, 1906–11, i. 57].

[3] *Theol. Lit.-Blatt*, 1905, 78.

[4] "Plato and St. Paul," *Class. Review*, 1896, 191.

[5] *Galaterbrief*, 257.

The doctrine of the *σάρξ* as the fountainhead of sin, which meets us first in Gal 5^{13} and afterwards above all in Ro $7^{18.\ 25}$ $8^{3ff.\ 12f.}$, is to be found occasionally in Jewish thought. Thus the Book of Sirach 23^{16} says: *ἄνθρωπος πόρνος ἐν σώματι σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ παύσηται ἕως ἂν ἐκκαύσῃ πῦρ*—or Eve in the Apocalypse of Moses, § 25: *κύριε, κύριε, σῶσόν με, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐπιστρέψω εἰς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῆς σαρκός*—and the writer of the so-called Fourth Book of Maccabees 7^{18}: *ὅσοι τῆς εὐσεβείας προνοοῦσιν ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας, οὗτοι μόνοι δύνανται κρατεῖν τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς παθῶν* (cp. also 1^{35} 2^{21}). Also the passage in the Slavonic Book of Enoch 30^{16} "*I knew his* [*Adam's*] *nature, he did not know his nature. Therefore his ignorance is a woe to him that he should sin*"—is, I think, to be understood in this sense, whereas the doctrine of the evil propensity, and, above all, of the body as the prison-house of the soul, is not germane to the matter. And the passages just quoted are isolated and in some measure exceptional, so that the ideas prevailing in these circles will hardly furnish an explanation, if explanation should be desired, of Paul's general theory of the origin of sin, which is such an important part of his teaching.

Even Philo, who repeatedly expresses himself in the same sense,[1] appears not to have influenced Paul directly, though many allege direct influence.[2] So far as an explanation is at all necessary, it is best, with Lietzmann, to suppose a common source for both; and other writers as well have found that source in Greek philosophy.

We must again, as in regard to other points already discussed, think more particularly of Stoicism, which in its later developments (in Panaetius and Posidonius) maintained an anthropological dualism.[3] This is found in its most rigorous form in Seneca, who is on this account most frequently quoted even by those who uphold the genuine-

[1] Cp. Zeller, *Philosophie*, iii. 2, 399 f.; Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii., 1898, 559 [Eng. trans. II. iii. 378]; Lietzmann, *Handbuch*, iii. 36 f.

[2] Cp., finally, Vollmer, *Die alttestamentl. Zitate bei Paulus*, 1895, 84 ff.

[3] Cp. Zeller, *Philosophie*, iii. 1 (1852), ^{3}1880, 564, 580 f. [Eng. trans., *History of Eclecticism in Greek Philosophy*, 1883, 47, 64 f.].

ness of the Pauline Epistles, *e.g.* O. Pfleiderer[1] and Titius.[2] Still, even Seneca does not express himself in such general terms as Paul: in Paul's case, therefore, so far as any connexion is to be supposed, the question will always be merely whether Stoicism was in any way a *buttress* of his thought. For with Neo-Pythagoreanism he appears hardly to have come into contact; his doctrine of the Flesh is therefore in the last resort distinctively his own.

In Gal $5^{19ff.}$ we find the first so-called list of vices, and companion lists are given in Ro $1^{29ff.}$ 13^{13} and Col $3^{5.8}$, while the enumerations in the Epistles to the Corinthians (1 Co $5^{10f.}$ $6^{9f.}$, 2 Co $12^{20f.}$) are, for the most part at any rate, accounted for by the special circumstances there presupposed. With these enumerations, however, one may compare 1 P 4^{3}, Eph 4^{31} $5^{3.5}$, Rev 21^{8} 22^{15}, 1 Ti $1^{9f.}$, and finally, in view of all these passages, Lk 18^{11}: since some at least of the expressions frequently recur, all these catalogues go back, if not to one, still to several common originals. Harris[3] thinks of the liturgy of the Great Day of Atonement; Wernle,[4] at least in general, of a Jewish list of vices: but everything in this connexion that really corresponds [in the Book of Wisdom ($12^{3ff.}$ $14^{22ff.}$), the so-called Fourth Book of Maccabees ($1^{20ff.}$ 2^{15}), and especially in Philo] is shown by Lietzmann[5] to be traceable to similar collections, first noted by Dieterich,[6] which are found in Greek philosophy, particularly in Stoicism. If Paul, as Feine[7] also remarks, in Ro 1^{28} employs the Stoic term *τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα* in close proximity to one of these lists, it is quite possible that in his enumeration of vices here and elsewhere he was under partial obligation to this philosophical system.[8]

[1] *Urchristentum*, i. 31 f. [Eng. trans. i. 41 f.].

[2] *Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit*, 1900, 249. For Seneca's views in general, cp. especially Zeller, *Philosophie*, iii. 1. 710 f. [Eng. trans., *Eclecticism*, 219 ff.].

[3] *The Teaching of the Apostles*, 1887, 82 ff.

[4] *Der Christ u. die Sünde bei Paulus*, 1897, 63 f., 129 ff.

[5] *Handbuch*, iii. 11.

[6] *Nekyia*, 163 ff.

[7] *Theol. Lit.-Blatt*, 1905, 78.

[8] Heinrici probably does not hold a different view when he says ["Der zweite Brief an die Korinther," in Meyer's *Kommentar*, vi. (1840), ^{8}1900, 227]: "If a man speaks extempore from the standpoint of a definite range of ideas, certain

On the other hand, the fact that the lists always open with sexual vices is in conformity with the detestation of these which we find already in Jewish thought.[1]

With Gal 6[2] "*Bear ye one another's burdens*," B. Bauer[2] and Steck[3] compare Seneca's words (*De Ira*, i. 5): "*homo in adiutorium mutuum generatus est*." Wetstein[4] finds a parallel to Gal 6[4] "*Let each man prove his own work, and then shall he have his glorying in regard of himself alone, and not of his neighbour*," in the words of Epictetus (*Diss.* iii. 18. 9): '*ψέγει σε.*' *αὐτὸς ὄψεται, πῶς ποιεῖ τὸ ἴδιον ἔργον.* In both cases the resemblance is insignificant, and calls for no further remark.

How highly Paul valued his friends, one learns first from the declaration in 1 Th 3[1], that he had decided—obviously with reluctance—to remain alone in Athens. It is possible that his ideas on the matter were partially influenced by the Stoic recommendation of friendship,[5] though such an explanation is, of course, not in any way necessary.

The desire expressed in 1 Th 5[23] "*And may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*," is not necessarily, and, at any rate, not consciously, based upon the trichotomy originating with Plato. It is more probable that that trichotomy is presupposed in He 4[12], which speaks of a "dividing of soul and spirit"; we shall see later that it is precisely in this matter that Platonism has elsewhere left traces of its influence. Lietzmann,[6] however, justly observes that it is not yet proved that these two expressions were used in pre-Christian times for two distinct parts of man's nature.

The behaviour of the so-called Corinthian parties (1 Co 1[11ff.]) is perhaps in some measure to be traced to the example set by contemporary philosophy, for petty wranglings between

fixed groups of these involuntarily form in his thought. It is therefore a mistake to trace Paul's 'catalogue of vices' in any especial degree to literary originals." Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 1908, 230 f. [Eng. trans. 320 f.], on the other hand, thinks of the vices named on the counters used in ancient games, and the list in Plautus, *Pseudolus* (360 ff.).

[1] Cp. Bousset, *Religion*, 489 f.

[2] *Christus*, 51.

[3] *Galaterbrief*, 257.

[4] *Nov. Test.* ii. 235.

[5] Cp. Zeller, *Philosophie*, iii. 1. 289 f. [Eng. trans., *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, 1870, 298 ff.]; von Arnim, *Stoic. Vet. Fragm.* iii. 181 f.

[6] *Handbuch*, iii. 91.

the various schools were very common. Accordingly, Paul dealt at once (v.[17]) with the criticism passed in Corinth upon his preaching, because it was compared with the discourses of heathen philosophers and rhetoricians: and, as he proceeds, he always associates the two features—the enthusiasm felt for individual teachers and the importance attached to the wisdom of this world (3[1ff. 4ff. 18ff. 22f.]).

In reference to 1 Co 2[14f.] "*The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: . . . But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, and he himself is judged of no man,*" Heinrici,[1] following Edwards, notes the passage from Plato's *Republic* (iii. 409 D, E): πονηρία ἀρετήν τε καὶ αὑτὴν οὔποτ' ἂν γνοίη, ἀρετὴ δὲ φύσεως παιδευομένης χρόνῳ ἅμα αὑτῆς τε καὶ πονηρίας ἐπιστήμην λήψεται. And, in fact, Paul might here also be indebted to the philosophical tradition. One would the more readily believe this if, as Schnedermann and Heinrici surmise, ἀνακρίνειν was a catchword among the Corinthians, who were so proud of their knowledge.

Again, as parallels to 1 Co 3[16] "*Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?*" (cp. 6[19])—one may, with Wetstein,[2] Spiess,[3] Steck,[4] and Heinrici,[5] recall certain Stoic aphorisms; particularly, however, in reference to v.[21] "*All things are yours,*" the ever-recurring phrase, "*All things belong to the Wise Man.*" Similarly, as Heinrici[6] and Lietzmann[7] show, the self-criticism of the Cynic, which we find especially in Epictetus, exhibits many points of comparison with 4[1ff.]. For the enumeration of the apostle's sufferings, v.[9ff.] (cp. 2 Co 4[8ff.] 11[23ff.]), B. Bauer[8] and Steck,[9] following Scultetus, referred to Pseudo-Heraclitus and Seneca. As regards 1 Co 4[9] "*We are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men,*" the passages quoted by these authorities from Seneca, *Ep.* 85, are less apposite, as Lietzmann[10] has recently observed, than the detailed exposition in *De Provid.* 2: "*Ego vero non miror, si aliquando impetum capiunt*

[1] *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 109.
[2] *Nov. Test.* ii. 111.
[3] *Logos*, 258.
[4] *Galaterbrief*, 254.
[5] *Der erste Brief*, 131 f., 209.
[6] *Ibid.* 140*, 142*.
[7] *Handbuch*, iii. 95.
[8] *Christus*, 52 ff.
[9] *Galaterbrief*, 256.
[10] *Handbuch*, iii. 96.

dii spectandi magnos viros, colluctantes cum aliqua calamitate. . . . Ecce spectaculum dignum, ad quod respiciat intentus operi suo Deus: ecce par Deo dignum, vir fortis cum mala fortuna compositus, utique si et provocavit. Non video, inquam, quid habeat in terris Jupiter pulchrius, si convertere animum velit, quam ut spectet Catonem, iam partibus non semel fractis, stantem nihilominus inter ruinas publicas rectum." It is not impossible that Paul had actually read earlier descriptions of that sort, and had imitated them, though very freely.

When Wetstein[1] compares with the warning (1 Co 5^{11}) against keeping company at table with notorious sinners, the saying of Epicurus [in Seneca, *Ep.* ii. 7 (19). 10]: "*Ante circumspiciendum est, cum quibus edas et bibas, quam quid edas et bibas*"—the succeeding words, "*Nam sine amico visceratio leonis ac lupi vita est,*" show that the citation is irrelevant here. Further, the words of Crates quoted by Steck[2] (and before him by B. Bauer[3] with reference to 2 Co 6^{14}) have in Seneca's account (*Ep.* i. 10. 1) the following form: "*Crates, ut aiunt . . . cum vidisset adulescentulum secreto ambulantem, interrogavit, quid illic solus faceret. Mecum, inquit, loquor. Cui Crates: Cave, inquit, rogo, et diligenter attende: cum homine malo loqueris.*" The meaning is therefore entirely different: Paul, however, needed no one to be his model in imparting such precepts.

On the other hand, the specific illustrations of the principle, "*Let each man abide in that calling wherein he was called*" (1 Co $7^{17ff.}$), not only remind us, as Heinrici[4] shows, of the form and matter of Stoic discourses, but may also in part have been directly derived from these. Scholars[5] have in particular been eager to compare with v.$^{21f.}$ "*Wast thou called as a bond servant? . . . remain rather in bondage,*" and v.$^{29f.}$ "*Henceforth* [*there is need*] *that those that have wives be as though they had none,*" etc.—the well-known passages from Seneca, *Ep.* v. 6 (47). 17, *Ad Marc.* 10, *De Benef.* iii. 20, and Epictetus, *Diss.* i. 19. 8 f.,

[1] *Nov. Test.* ii. 119.
[2] *Galaterbrief*, 255.
[3] *Christus*, 51 f.
[4] *Der erste Brief*, 229.
[5] Cp. B. Bauer, *Christus*, 47 f.; Steck, *Galaterbrief*, 254 f.; J. Weiss, *Die christliche Freiheit*, 16 f., 26; Lietzmann, *Handbuch*, iii. 108.

ii. 23. 43, iii. 24. 60, iv. 1. 159; and the earlier Stoics, in fact, expressed themselves similarly. As Paul is otherwise influenced by them, he may in some measure have attached himself to them in this matter also. The same judgment may be passed on 1 Co 8^{11}: *ἀπόλλυται ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἐν τῇ σῇ γνώσει, ὁ ἀδελφός, δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν*, and the passage cited by Heinrici[1] from Epict. *Diss.* ii. 9. 3: *ὅρα . . . μή τί πως ὡς θηρίον ποιήσῃς· εἰ δὲ μή, ἀπώλεσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον*—where even the word *ἀπολλύναι* reminds one of Paul.

But with 1 Co $9^{19ff.}$ "*Though I was free from all men, I brought myself under bondage to all, that I might gain the more*," B. Bauer[2] had no right even to compare Seneca's recommendation of compromise (*Ep.* i. 5. 2 f.); for this passage shows rather, as Heinrici[3] says, the difference between Christianity and Stoicism. "The Stoic is brought by his *ἄσκησις* to moral rigorism, devoid of love and compassion: as for the Christian, his liberty, conforming to the standard of the *νόμος Χριστοῦ*, makes him the iron hero of self-denial." Paul may have borrowed also from the Stoics, with whom it was a favourite idea, the figure of the competitor in the games (1 Co $9^{24ff.}$, Ph $3^{13f.}$), as not only Steck[4] but also Heinrici,[5] Feine,[6] and Lietzmann[7] suppose. We are reminded of the Stoics, too, by the term *κηρύττειν*, used here and elsewhere of his vocation as a preacher.[8]

When in 1 Co 11^{1} and similarly in Ro 15^{7} Christ is set up as the best of all patterns, it is hardly likely that the yearning of the age for a good man, to whose side men could rally, has been a determining suggestion for this idea. But the reference to "nature" in 1 Co 11^{14} has, I think, a Stoic ring; and the comparison with the body in $12^{12ff.}$ and Ro $12^{4ff.}$ was, as Heinrici[9] in particular shows, an especial favourite in this school.

On the other hand, when Steck,[10] with reference to 1 Co 13, cites not only the description of Eros in Plato's

[1] *Der erste Brief*, 264. [2] *Christus*, 63. [3] *Der erste Brief*, 287.
[4] *Galaterbrief*, 254. [5] *Der erste Brief*, 288.
[6] *Theol. Lit.-Blatt*, 1905, 79. [7] *Handbuch*, iii. 119.
[8] Cp. Heinrici, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther*, 220.
[9] *Der erste Brief*, 383, 386. [10] *Galaterbrief*, 255.

Symposium (178 ff.), but also a passage from Seneca (*Ep.* 88. 30), we must point out that the resemblance is only slight, and calls for no further remark. Wetstein[1] quotes with more justification another passage [*Ep.* iii. 6 (27). 2]: "*Clamo mihi ipse: numera annos tuos, et pudebit eadem velle, quae volueras puer, eadem parare,*" in illustration of 1 Co 13[11] "*When I was a child, I spake as a child, . . . now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things*"; and Heinrici[2] compares with v.[12] "*Now we see in a mirror, darkly,*" similar utterances of Greek philosophers. But indebtedness is nowhere to be inferred. Indeed the well-known injunction, 14[34] "*Let the women keep silence in the churches,*" sounds very different from Stoic teaching.

In the Second Epistle, the *μεταμορφούμεθα* of 3[18] (cp. 5[17], Ro 12[2], Col 3[9f.]) finds a parallel in the words of Seneca (*Ep.* 6. 1): "*Intellego, Lucili, non emendari me tantum, sed transfigurari*"—which in its turn may possibly go back to earlier originals: but no original was needed for Paul. It is probable, however, that, as Heinrici[3] supposes, Paul is indebted to philosophy for his comparison of the body to an earthen vessel or a tabernacle, 2 Co 4[7] 5[1], and for the distinction drawn between the *ἔξω* and the *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος*, 4[16]. Above all, it is to philosophy that the yearning for liberation from this burden of the body (5[2. 4]) is ultimately to be traced. The passage, however, which Paul chiefly has in mind is, I think, Wis 9[15] "*For a corruptible body weigheth down the soul, and the earthly tabernacle lieth heavy on a mind that museth upon many things*"; and this passage again is certainly based on a sentence in Plato (*Phaedo*, 81 C): so that E. Pfleiderer[4] is justified in holding that "through the Book of Wisdom, the finest work of classical antiquity, viz. the immortal Phaedo, has been passed on into our New Testament—and that not only in its thought, but even with two of its verbal forms (*ἐπίγειος* and *βαρούμενοι*)." The greatest similarity is, of course, again to be found in a passage of Seneca, which Heinrici[5] compares, though he

[1] *Nov. Test.* ii. 157.
[2] *Der erste Brief*, 404.
[3] *Der zweite Brief*, 156, 166, 171.
[4] *Die Philosophie Heraklits*, 1886, 296.
[5] *Der zweite Brief*, 191.

does not regard it as the direct original of Paul's words, and which contains an application of this thought that resembles 2 Co 5^{9}. The passage (*Ep.* 102. 22, 29) runs thus: "*Cum venerit dies ille, qui mixtum hoc divini humanique secernat, corpus hic, ubi inveni, relinquam, ipse me dis reddam. Nec nunc sine illis sum, sed gravi terrenoque detineor. . . . Haec cogitatio nihil sordidum animo subsidere sinit, nihil humile, nihil crudele. Deos rerum omnium esse testes ait. Illis nos adprobari, illis in futurum parari iubet et aeternitatem proponere.*" And again, the fear that we might be found naked (2 Co 5^{3}), and the idea that in visions the soul is frequently separated from the body ($12^{2f.}$), are Greek, and in view of all that has hitherto been said are not to be traced (as O. Pfleiderer[1] would trace them) to "animistic popular metaphysic." Heinrici[2] and Titius[3] emphasize, and with perfect justice, the difference between the Greek and the Pauline belief in immortality, but in an equal degree the indebtedness of the latter to the former.

When, on the other hand, Spiess compares with Paul's refusal to vaunt himself ($10^{12ff.}$) the words of Epictetus (*Frag.* 21, ed. Schenkl): *διὰ τοῦτον ἐπαινεῖν Ἀγριππῖνον δίκαιον, ὅτι πλείστου ἄξιος ἀνὴρ γενόμενος οὐδεπώποτε ἐπῄνεσεν ἑαυτόν, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ἄλλος τις αὐτὸν ἐπῄνει, ἠρυθρία*, it must be pointed out that in this passage and in 1 Co 1^{31} Paul is drawing upon Jer $9^{22f.}$. And in dealing with 2 Co 12^{15} "*I will most gladly spend and be spent for your souls*" (cp. also Ph 2^{17}), there is still less need, with B. Bauer[4] and Steck,[5] to seek for a model in the words of Seneca, *Ep.* 9. 10: "*In quid amicum paro? Ut habeam, pro quo mori possim, ut habeam, quem in exilium sequar, cuius me morti et opponam et inpendam,*" —or in any similar writer previous to him.

In the Epistle to the Romans, Wetstein[6] compares with $2^{28f.}$ "*He is not a Jew which is one outwardly . . . but he which is one inwardly,*" the words of Epictetus (*Diss.* ii. 9. 20): *οὐχ ὁρᾷς, πῶς ἕκαστος λέγεται Ἰουδαῖος, πῶς Σύρος, πῶς*

[1] *Urchristentum*, i. 324 [Eng. trans. i. 455].
[2] *Der zweite Brief*, 192 f., 391*, 408.
[3] *Paulinismus*, 64 ff., 245 ff.
[4] *Christus*, 51.
[5] *Galaterbrief*, 255 f.
[6] *Nov. Test.* ii. 35.

Αἰγύπτιος ; Καὶ ὅταν τινὰ ἐπαμφοτερίζοντα ἴδωμεν, εἰώθαμεν λέγειν, 'οὐκ ἔστιν Ἰουδαῖος, ἀλλ' ὑποκρίνεται.' Ὅταν ἀναλάβῃ τὸ πάθος τὸ τοῦ βεβαμμένου καὶ ῥηρημένου, τότε καὶ ἔστι τῷ ὄντι καὶ καλεῖται Ἰουδαῖος. But it is idle to think of any connexion, even an indirect one, between the two passages.

There is more plausibility in the view that Paul's doctrine of the universality of sin (stated in Ro $3^{9.\ 22f.}$, and already implied in Gal 3^{10}) is partially derived from the similar idea in later Stoicism.[1] He was, however, more deeply influenced by his own experience, and by the thought (Gal 2^{21}) that if righteousness was through the law, Christ died for nought. Accordingly no other explanation of these statements is really called for.

Similarly, the estimation of death as a punishment for sin (in Ro 5^{12} and elsewhere) is much more probably due to Jewish thought [2] than to such a statement as that quoted by Steck [3] from Seneca (*Nat. Quaest.* ii. 59), that death is "*in omnes constitutum capitale supplicium et quidem constitutione iustissima.*" Further, the description of the consequences of Adam's Fall for the whole creation, Ro $8^{20ff.}$—if it may be dealt with here—is adequately explained by the similar speculation in Jewish thought,[4] and Curtius' reference [5] to Plato's description in the *Critias* (109 ff.) becomes unnecessary.

If the pre-existence of the soul were (as Hilgenfeld [6] supposes) implied in Ro 7^{9} *ἐλθούσης τῆς ἐντολῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν*, we should be compelled ultimately to seek the origin of this idea in Greek philosophy. But the thought is only this, that sin, after showing its power in others, came to life again in Paul: accordingly no derivation from foreign sources is required.

For the words of v.[15] "*That which I do, I know not; for not what I would, that do I practise; but what I hate, that I*

[1] Cp. Zeller, *Philosophie*, iii. 1. 252 f., 714 [Eng. trans., *Stoics*, etc., 256 f., *Eclectics*, 221 ff.]; Windelband, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie* (1892), [3]1903, 189, n. 2 [Eng. trans., *A History of Philosophy*, 1893, 231, n. 2].

[2] Cp. Clemen, *Die christl. Lehre von der Sünde*, i., 1897, 242 ff.

[3] *Galaterbrief*, 252.

[4] Cp. Clemen, *Sünde*, i. 173.

[5] *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1893, 934.

[6] "Der Römerbrief," *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1893, i. 146 f.

do," one would be better justified in quoting, with Lightfoot[1] and J. Weiss,[2] Epictetus' description (*Diss.* ii. 26. 1): ἐπεὶ ὁ ἁμαρτάνων οὐ θέλει ἁμαρτάνειν, ἀλλὰ κατορθῶσαι, δῆλον ὅτι ὃ μὲν θέλει οὐ ποιεῖ (cp. 4), or similar passages; in fact, this view was virtually implied in the dualistic anthropology which we found ourselves compelled to trace in part to philosophical influences.

On the other hand, the parallels cited by Spiess[3] and Steck[4] to Ro 8^{28} "*And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good*"—from Seneca (*De Provid.* 1 ff.) and Epictetus (*Ench.* 18), are essentially different. With them the Wise Man himself makes all things serve his best interests: with Paul a man's confidence is placed on God. This also distinguishes Paul's saying, Ro 8^{35} "*Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?*"—from Seneca's (*Ep.* 85. 26 f.) again quoted by Steck:[5] "*Quid ergo, inquit, mortem, vincla, ignes, alia tela fortunae non timebit? Non. Scit enim illa non esse mala, sed videri. Omnia ista humanae vitae formidines putat. Describe captivitatem, verbera, catenas, egestatem et membrorum lacerationes vel per morbum vel per iniuriam et quicquid aliud adtuleris: inter lymphatos metus numerat.*" Only the general tone is the same in the two passages—and the rhetorical form, with which we are at present not at all concerned.

As for Paul's deterministic views stated in Ro 9 (and similarly in Ph 2^{13}), although they are primarily based on the Old Testament, they may yet be collaterally derived from Stoicism. And the same may be said, on still better grounds, of the attempt made in Ro $9^{22ff.}$ to justify the wrath of God—which, however, is long-suffering—as a means of making known the riches of His glory; and it may be said, too, of the expectation, which again certainly originates in the Jewish consciousness, of an ultimate conversion of Israel, $11^{26ff.}$. For the Stoics also, as Windelband[6] says,

[1] *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 316, n. 2.
[2] *Die christl. Freiheit*, 20 f.
[3] *Logos*, 234.
[4] *Galaterbrief*, 252 f.
[5] *Ibid.* 256.
[6] *Lehrbuch*, 161 [Eng. trans. 197].

"while thus deducing vice as the necessary foil for the good . . . put it forward as a final consideration, that the eternal Providence ultimately turns even the evil to good, and has in it but an apparently refractory means for the fulfilment of its own highest ends."

The idea of λογικὴ λατρεία, 12[1], certainly comes from philosophy: if Lietzmann[1] refers in particular to the Hermetic writings, this literature is so far not peculiar. Further, in the exhortation, v.[3]: μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, Paul may possibly have been indebted to such originals for the thought as well as for the form: Wetstein[2] cites them in great numbers. On the other hand, v.[19] "*Give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord,*" is not even indirectly to be traced to Seneca, as Steck[3] and van den Bergh van Eysinga[4] maintain. For when Seneca says (*De Ira*, iii. 12. 39): "*Maximum remedium irae dilatio est: ut primus eius fervor relanguescat et caligo, quae premit mentem, aut residat aut minus densa sit . . . Primam iram non audebimus oratione mulcere: surda est et amens; dabimus illi spatium,*" it is human wrath, not divine, that is spoken of; in the passage "*Primam . . . spatium*" it is, in fact, the wrath of another.

That Paul, further, is indebted to Stoicism for his high appreciation of the State in Ro 13 is very unlikely; for latterly Stoicism encouraged men to take no part in civic life. Again, in regard to the exhortation of v.[11] "*Now it is high time for you to awake out of sleep,*" there is no need, with O. Pfleiderer,[5] to recall Seneca, *Ep.* vi. 1 (53). 8: "*Expergiscamur ergo, ut errores nostros coarguere possimus.*" So, too, the consistent and restricted vegetarianism which, according to chap. 14, was found in the Church at Rome, has no connexion with Pythagoreanism. As he is referring to the Church at *Rome*, such a connexion would be in itself conceivable; but the comparison of the weak and the strong with the circumcision and the Gentiles, which is probably present in 15[7ff.], points

[1] *Handbuch*, iii. 61.
[2] *Nov. Test.* ii. 78.
[3] *Galaterbrief*, 253.
[4] *Museum*, 1910, 304.
[5] *Urchristentum*, i. 34 [Eng. trans. i. 47].

rather—like the rejection of similar requirements in Col $2^{16ff.}$ and He 13^{10}—to true-born Jews. One may admit that even they might have been already influenced by Greek ideas; and in so far as the dualistic anthropology which produced these ascetic requirements was of foreign origin, this may actually have happened. If that is so, we again see how foreign influences have merely strengthened a tendency already existing.

When Curtius [1] on Ph 2^{15} remarks: "As the Academics turned aside from the city that was polluted by the death of Socrates and founded a new community, so Christians, though in the midst of the old world, ought to be a new generation" —that is clearly very far-fetched: the expressions are explained by Dt 32^5. Further, in reference to Ph $3^{10ff.}$ "*Becoming conformed unto his death; if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead. Not that I have already obtained*"—B. Bauer [2] and O. Pfleiderer [3] quote the passage cited above (p. 68) from Seneca (*Ep.* 6. 1) with the succeeding words: "*Nec hoc promitto iam aut spero, nihil in me superesse, quod mutandum sit*"; but the resemblance is too general. On the other hand, in Ph 4^8 "*Whatsoever things are true, are honourable, are just, are pure, are lovely, are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things*"—natural morality, as Haupt [4] expresses it, is included in Christian morality. Paul was influenced by philosophy, not merely in his figures of speech, but also, as one would expect, in much of the substance of his thought, although for the most part only in the direction which his mind had taken, or would have taken, apart from philosophy.

When the Epistle to the Hebrews $1^{2ff.}$ calls the Son not only (as Paul had already done in 1 Co 8^6, Col $1^{15f.}$) the First-born, through whom God also made the worlds, but at the same time the very image of His substance, compares Him with the angels, designates Him as "this day begotten," and then in $4^{14ff.}$ describes Him above all as the great high priest

[1] *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1893, 934. [2] *Christus*, 50.
[3] *Urchristentum*, i. 34 [Eng. trans. i. 47].
[4] "Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe," in Meyer's *Kommentar*, viii.–ix. (1841), 8 or 7 1902, iv. 166.

after the order of Melchizedek, who has neither father nor mother (7^3), who makes intercession for us (v.[25]), who is holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners (v.[26])—in all this it transfers to Jesus predicates which in Philo are applied to the Logos.[1] And, as finally Kirn [2] brings out in detail, the extensive agreement—which the obvious differences cannot annul—between the Philonic statements and the Gospel of John, shows that there must be a connexion between them. This does not, of course, mean that the Johannine literature—for the idea of the Logos appears [3] also in Rev 19^{13} and 1 Jn 1^1—is directly dependent on Philo, still less that the author of the Fourth Gospel, as Norden [4] and O. Pfleiderer [5] suppose, must have read the work of Heraclitus. But the idea which the Johannine writings employ and the Epistle to the Hebrews presupposes, is partially derived from the philosophy of Heraclitus and the Stoics: from what source the Johannine literature derived it in the first instance, and how in all likelihood the idea obtained this particular form, we shall see on a subsequent page (p. 354).

The Epistle to the Hebrews, the Fourth Gospel, and the First Epistle of John show themselves indebted to philosophy—the philosophy of Plato and his successors—in this also, that they regard all this perishable world as only an image or adumbration of the true heavenly realities. So too, when in Eph 3^{15} it is said that every family in heaven and on earth is named from the Father, the fundamental idea is the same. On the other hand—if

[1] For the fullest discussion, cp. Aall, *Der Logos*, ii., 1899, 38 ff.

[2] Art. "Logos," *Prot. Realencykl.*[3] xi., 1902, 602 ff.

[3] Jülicher, *Einleitung in das N. T.* (1894), [5.6]1906, 241, says: "The expression 'the Word of God' (Rev 19^{13}) as a name for Jesus probably does not offer us a parallel to the connexion worked out in detail [*durchgeführt*] in Jn $1^{1ff.}$, between the historical Jesus and the premundane Logos." But I can only subscribe to this view if a special emphasis is laid on the phrase "worked out in detail." And there seems to me to be still less ground for Bousset's surmise ["Die Offenbarung Johannis," in Meyer's *Kommentar* (1859), [6]1906, 431]: "It is possible that this is merely the idle notion of some copyist who was only too willing to solve for the reader the mystery of the unknown name."

[4] *Kunstprosa*, ii. 472 ff.

[5] *Urchristentum*, ii. 339 [Eng. trans. iv. 7 f.]. For the opposite view, see also Wendland, *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1898, 794; Gruppe, *Griech. Mythologie u. Religionsgeschichte*, 1906, 1629, n. 6.

at this point a supplementary remark may be permitted in order to complete the discussion—the description of Jewish legislation in regard to meats and feast-days as a shadow of the things to come, Col 2^{17}, cannot have this sense, which is opposed to Paul's general view.

In regard to 1 P 3^4 *ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος*, Feine [1] notes the fact that the last two adjectives are to be found in the description of the Wise Man in Stobaeus (*Ecl.* ii. 6. 6). But as in the First Epistle of Peter the words occur in an exhortation to wives, the correspondence is, I think, accidental; at any rate, the expressions have a different sense in the two cases.

The exhortation to slaves and masters, Eph $6^{5ff.}$, is traced by B. Bauer [2] to the imaginary dialogue in Seneca, which O. Pfleiderer [3] also compares. The passage runs thus [*Ep.* v. 6 (47). 1]: "'*Servi sunt.*' *Immo homines.* '*Servi sunt.*' *Immo contubernales.* '*Servi sunt.*' *Immo humiles amici.* '*Servi sunt.*' *Immo conservi.*" One may at the most suppose that Christianity, in its estimate of slavery, was influenced by the view ordinarily held among the later Stoics.

On 1 Ti 5^1 "*Rebuke not an elder, but exhort him as a father; the younger men as brethren: the elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters, in all purity,*" Wetstein [4] quotes similar utterances from Greek and Roman thinkers, while Deissmann [5] quotes an inscription which no doubt is late but is yet uninfluenced by Christianity. It commends a certain Theocles as "*bearing himself to his equals in age as a brother, to his elders as a son, to children as a father, being adorned with all virtue.*" On the other hand, it is impossible to suppose that the well-known words of 1 Ti 5^{23} "*Be no longer a drinker of water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities,*" are connected with the advice of Seneca, *De Tranqu. An.* 15, which B. Bauer [6] again quotes: "*Aliquando vectatio iterque, et mutata regio vigorem*

[1] *Theol. Lit.-Blatt*, 1905, 79.
[2] *Christus*, 57.
[3] *Urchristentum*, i. 36 [Eng. trans. i. 49].
[4] *Nov. Test.* ii. 339.
[5] *Licht vom Osten*, 224 f. [Eng. trans. 313].
[6] *Christus*, 64.

dabunt, convictusque et liberalior potio: nonnumquam et usque ad ebrietatem veniendum, non ut mergat nos, sed ut deprimat."

In Ja 1^{17} the hexameter: *πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον*, has often been regarded as borrowed, and is thought by Fischer[1] to be a complete sentence (in which *ἐστίν* is to be supplied). But, as Zahn[2] remarks, this is to attribute to the author unnecessarily a very pointless use of a somewhat frivolous saying. The verse appears, therefore, to have flowed from his pen unintentionally—a circumstance not without parallel.

With reference to Ja $1^{23f.}$, where the mere hearer is likened to the man who beholds his natural face in a mirror and then forgets what manner of man he was, Wetstein,[3] Theile,[4] and von Soden[5] compare Plutarch, *De Recta Ratione Audiendi*, 42 B, where, however, the following is the full quotation: *οὐ γὰρ ἐκ κουρείου μὲν ἀναστάντα δεῖ τῷ κατόπτρῳ παραστῆναι καὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἅψασθαι τὴν περικοπὴν τῶν τριχῶν ἐπισκοποῦντα καὶ τῆς κουρᾶς τὴν διαφοράν, ἐκ δὲ ἀκροάσεως ἀπιόντα καὶ σχολῆς οὐκ εὐθὺς ἀφορᾶν χρὴ πρὸς ἑαυτόν, καταμανθάνοντα τὴν ψυχήν εἴ τι τῶν ὀχληρῶν ἀποτεθειμένη καὶ περιττῶν ἐλαφροτέρα γέγονε καὶ ἡδίων.* Still less relevant are the words of Seneca (*De Ira*, 2. 36): "*Quibusdam, ut ait Sextius, iratis profuit adspexisse speculum*"—or the aphorism of Bias: *θεώρει ὥσπερ ἐν κατόπτρῳ τὰς ἑαυτοῦ πράξεις.* The passages cited by Theile[6] as parallels to the general idea are no doubt apposite, but do not, of course, require to be presupposed in order to elucidate the view of our author here or in the succeeding context.

On the other hand, *τροχὸς τῆς γενέσεως*, 3^{6}, is and certainly remains—as von Soden,[7] H. Holtzmann,[8] and

[1] "Ein Spruchvers im Jakobusbrief," *Philologus*, 1891, 377 ff.

[2] *Einleitung in das N.T.* (1897–99), ²1900, i. 85 [Eng. trans., *Introduction to the N.T.*, 1909, i. 118].

[3] *Nov. Test.* ii. 664.

[4] *Commentarius in Epistolam Jacobi*, 1833, 83.

[5] *Hand-Kommentar zum N.T.* iii. 2 (1891), ³1899, 169; cp. also H. Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N.T.* (1885), ³1892, 338.

[6] *Commentarius*, 84.

[7] *Hand-Kommentar*, iii. 2, 193.

[8] *Einleitung*, 338.

Grafe[1] point out—a philosophical term, which the Orphics in their Mysteries used in reference to the soul's "circle of generation." But the Epistle of James employs it in the attenuated sense of "course of life": it is idle, therefore, to speak here of an influence of philosophy on Christian thought.

B.—THE LEADING IDEAS OF CHRISTIANITY.

1. The Ideas inherited from Judaism.

a. God and Intermediary Beings.

(*a*) *God.*—The fact that Christianity, like Judaism before it, regards the Old Testament as authoritative, putting Christian writings alongside of it only in the latest books of the New Testament, can be completely explained by the inner development of these two systems. "For the religions that have produced a specifically religious literature," Schmiedel[2] justly remarks, "it is positively a natural law that at a certain point in their development they should form out of it a canon of absolute sanctity." It may, however, be conceded to Kuenen,[3] Stave,[4] and Cheyne[5] that this "work of collection and systematization . . . may very well have been expedited by the circumstance that the Jews had in their immediate neighbourhood (namely, among the Persians), and within their view, a sacred literature in a more or less developed form." But this supposition is not necessary.[6]

[1] *Die Stellung u. Bedeutung des Jakobusbriefes in der Entwicklung des Urchristentums*, 1904, 45, n. 1.

[2] Art. "Kanon," *Allg. Encykl. d. Wiss. u. Künste*, ii. xxxii., 1882, 310.

[3] *De Godsdienst van Israel*, ii., 1870, 64 [Eng. trans., *The Religion of Israel*, 1874–5, ii. 156].

[4] *Über den Einfluss des Parsismus auf das Judentum*, 1898, 135 f.

[5] Art. "Zoroastrianism," *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, iv., 1903, 5438.

[6] Bellangé (*Le judaisme et l'histoire du peuple juif*, 1889, 281 f.) is reported by Cheyne (*The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, 1891, 281) as stating the view "that Judaism essaying in the Achaemenid epoch to speak of a law, a prophet, an Exodus, and one only God, in the very countries in which

After this preliminary remark, which could most fittingly be made here, we turn now to the proper subject of this section. The first point to be noted is that monotheism also, which Christianity inherited from Judaism, finds an entirely adequate explanation in the development of the Israelitish religion itself.[1] Yet in recent times[2] an endeavour has been made to explain it by foreign, and particularly by Babylonian, influences. It is true that Delitzsch,[3] who at first expressed himself definitely in this sense, now maintains "that the Old Testament account of Jahweh is absolutely correct, according to which the worship of Him who was subsequently the national God of Israel, Jahweh-Jahu, goes back to a time long before Moses"—a point which we need not investigate here. Winckler,[4] on the other hand, says expressly: "Just as Christianity and its ideas have not been confined to the soil of Judah, and its fundamental features have developed themselves in other lands within the domain of Oriental civilization, so, too, the fundamental ideas by which Jahwism, monotheism, is distinguished from the prevailing Oriental theory of the universe, cannot have arisen in Judah alone, and above all cannot have been cultivated there alone. The new ideas that determine the development of humanity can find their expression only where the human spirit is ripe for their genesis, where the surrounding conditions supply the impulse. . . . A people that had just emerged from the most primitive conditions of semi-nomadism, a people for which the level of Canaanitish life was some-

Mazdeism developed, must have found in Mazdeism a powerful helper, and that we must regard Judaism as a religion *constamment imitatrice de la persane.*" Cheyne justly remarks: "This is a manifest exaggeration."

[1] Cp., finally, Marti, *Die Religion des A.T.*, 1906, 47 ff.

[2] Cheyne, *Origin*, 284, refers to Goldziher as an earlier upholder of this view, but I have not been able to find evidence for this.

[3] *Babel u. Bibel*, i., 1902, 44 ff.; *Anmerkungen zu dem Vortrag Babel u. Bibel*, 1903, 72 f., 77 f.; *Babel u. Bibel, ein Rückblick u. Ausblick*, 1904, 20. [For some of these references, see *Bible and Babel*, 68 ff., 130 ff., 192 ff.] For criticism of the older arguments, cp. especially Gunkel, *Israel u. Babylonien*, 1903, 28 ff.; Zimmern, *Keilinschriften u. Bibel nach ihrem religionsgeschichtl. Zusammenhang*, 1903, 34: in reference to Delitzsch's shifting position, see König, *Die Babel-Bibel-Frage u. die wissenschaftliche Methode*, 1904, 31 ff.

[4] *Die Keilinschriften u. das A.T.* (1872), ³1903, 208 f.

thing higher, could not develop or receive ideas that were several planes removed from their daily needs and their power of conception. These are the circumstances, however, amid which Israel, and more especially Judah, lived; and according to the statement even of the prophets who raised their voice against them, these conditions prevailed among the people till late historical times. . . . Accordingly, one has to distinguish between the religious, monotheistic movement, which had its beginnings and determining conditions in the rest of the Eastern world, at the centres of spiritual life, and the course of development followed by the people of Judah and Israel, which took up this movement and carried it on in a manner that has been decisive for their own history as well as for the evolution of the idea. The whole theory of the universe represented by monotheism is originally foreign to the tribes that ultimately became Israel and Judah, and did not take form in the minds of any of *their* members so long as they guided the plough and tended the flock. It was brought from the centres of civilization, where the human spirit endeavoured to harmonize all the conclusions of a highly developed knowledge with all the appearances of the surrounding world, and where new ideas were at strife with old." Winckler[1] refers in particular to the monotheistic reforms of Amenophis IV., which, however, as he himself says, were soon annulled, and which cannot be shown to have influenced the development of the people of Israel.[2] And if Jeremias,[3] on the other hand, endeavours once more to exhibit "monotheistic currents within Babylonian religion," Bäntsch[4] points out that "ancient Oriental monotheism meets us in the garb of a speculative doctrine, Israelitish monotheism in the form of an open and clear religious confession of faith in the one God." What he himself proposes as a substitute, we need not here examine, since it is alleged to

[1] *Keilinschriften*, 211; cp. *Abraham als Babylonier, Joseph als Ägypter*, 1903.

[2] Cp. also Spiegelberg, *Der Aufenthalt Israels in Ägypten*, 1904, 47.

[3] *Monotheistische Strömungen innerhalb der babylonischen Religion*, 1905; cp. also *Verhandlungen des II. internat. Kongresses f. allg. Religionsgeschichte*, 1905, 141 ff.

[4] *Altorientalischer u. israelitischer Monotheismus*, 1906, 43.

have influenced even Moses:[1] but monotheism was a point of development that was reached in Israel only at a subsequent date, and no derivation from foreign influences, even as an additional and co-operating factor, is at all necessary.

One would be more inclined to suppose, with Cheyne[2] and Moffatt,[3] that at a later period such an influence was exerted by Parsism, with its spiritual idea of God and a mode of worship that, generally speaking, gave no place to graven images. But Stave[4] justly remarks: "However high Ahura Mazda may stand as a moral deity with his demand for 'good thoughts, good words, and good works,' and as creator of the moral order of the universe, as author of all that is good in the world and victor in the contest with Angra Mainyu, there is quite clearly a qualitative difference between him and Jahweh. This results, above all, from the fact that the idea of the good and bad is not grasped in Mazdeism in its purity and truth, but is still confused with the natural, so that the good often appears as what is naturally living, pure, and serviceable, and in harmony with this the bad often appears as what is naturally dead, impure, and harmful." Whether Parsism has not by this very teaching influenced Judaism, and indirectly also one tendency which doubtless becomes less and less prominent in primitive Christianity, is a point which can only be examined later.

Here the question arises whether certain designations of God, in which definite ideas regarding Him find expression, were of foreign origin; and whether these ideas were thus reinforced from abroad. No doubt there may be some uncertainty whether the first of these names to which such an origin is ascribed, viz. "the Highest" (ὕψιστος), really

[1] A similar remark applies to the views of Wilke, *Die astralmythologische Weltanschauung u. das A.T.*, 1907, 27 ff.; for he regards Abraham as a historical personality.

[2] *Origin*, 270 ff.; but when he appeals to A. Réville and d'Eichthal for a more sweeping assertion, he misrepresents at least the former of these. But cp. p.77, n. 6 above.

[3] "Zoroastrianism and Primitive Christianity," *Hibb. Journ.*, 1903–4, ii. 355 f.

[4] *Einfluss*, 122 f.

belongs to this category. Apart from Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, this name is found only in Mk 5^{7} (where, however, A and Syr.^{P} read ζῶντος), and in He 7^{1}, where it is taken from Gn 14^{18}; and it is therefore described by Harnack [1] as distinctively Lucan. But that is, I think, unjustifiable: probably it is not only the original reading in Mark, but it is also a term found in Jewish thought, though with varying frequency at different times.[2] However, it is still more important that in every case in which it meets us elsewhere, Schürer [3] and Cumont [4] and (in part at any rate) Lidzbarski [5] and Wendland [6] trace it to Jewish influence. But Cumont himself points out that the name appears also in Syria, where there is no presumption of such an influence; [7] and so, too, Gruppe [8] and Bousset [9] regard it as independent of Judaism. And indeed it appears to be of foreign origin even in Judaism and Christianity. For there it comes fully into use only when Jahweh was no longer regarded merely as the highest, but as the only, God. For this very reason one will, of course, prefer to derive it not from Marduk or Ahura Mazda, but rather from a Syrian or Phoenician deity with whom the Jews were really brought into connexion in later times, and to whom the term was actually applied.

Not only in Mark (14^{61}), but also in three passages in the Pauline Epistles (2 Co 11^{31}, Ro 1^{25} 9^{5}—the others are of a different character), God is called the Blessed (εὐλογητός). This also is a designation that already occurs in Jewish thought and afterwards passed into common use, but it is found

[1] "Das Magnifikat der Elisabeth (Luk. 1^{46-55}) nebst einigen Bemerkungen zu Luk. 1 u. 2," *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1900, 550.

[2] Cp. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees*, 1902, 213.

[3] "Die Juden im bosporanischen Reiche und die Genossenschaften der σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὕψιστον," *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1897, 200 ff.

[4] "Hypsistos," *Suppl. à la revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique*, 1897; "Les mystères de Sabazius et le judaisme," *Comptes rendus de l'acad. des inscr.*, 1906, 63 ff.

[5] "Balsamem," *Ephem. f. semit. Epigr.* i., 1902, 243 ff.

[6] In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 107 f.

[7] *Hypsistos*, 3, n. 1; "Jupiter Summus Exsuperantissimus," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1906, 334, where, moreover, this last expression is otherwise explained than in the earlier publication.

[8] *Mythologie*, 1603, n. 7, 1608, n. 3.

[9] *Religion*, 356 f., 591, n. 2; *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 1907, 90.

also in inscriptions from Palmyra.[1] One may therefore suppose a foreign origin for it also; but obviously it would be a question merely of the acceleration of a development within Judaism, a development that would of itself have led, and perhaps did lead, to the same result.

In concluding this section, I should like to mention further the doctrine of creation by the word of God. It is expressly maintained in He 11^3, and also assumed in 2 Co 4^6 and perhaps in Ro 4^{17}; but the idea underlies other passages as well, and may therefore be discussed at this point. The doctrine goes back, of course, to the Old Testament; but in the Epistle to the Hebrews especially, which here as elsewhere exhibits a connexion with Philo, it may be that Egyptian religion also (through the medium of Philo's writings) has been an influence at work. For in that religion, as Maspero[2] in particular shows, creation is from the first effected by the divine word. On the other hand, such an influence as Weber[3] and Garbe[4] have attributed to Indian religion or philosophy, is justly denied by Hopkins[5] and Grill.[6] And whatever Winckler[7] and his *fidus Achates*, Jeremias,[8] may say, the Babylonian Mummu, which appears in the Creation-myth of the cuneiform inscriptions, first as an epithet of Tiâmat and then perhaps as a name of the son of Apsû, and which, as we must admit, appears also in Damascius (*De Prim. Princ.* 125) as νοητὸς κόσμος, has nothing to do with the word of the creator. We must note especially that this idea was adhered to in later times simply because there was a disinclination to bring God into closer connexion with the world; and this transcendentalism has occasioned also one speculation which had a much greater significance, and will

[1] Cp., finally, Bousset, *Religion*, 360, n. 3.

[2] *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient classique*, 1875, 147 ff.

[3] *Miscellen*, 1; *Indische Studien*, ix., 1865, 473 ff.

[4] *Die Sâṃkyaphilosophie*, 1894, 103 f.

[5] *India*, 147, n. 1.

[6] *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, 1902, 206, n. 1.

[7] *Altorientalische Forschungen*, iii. 2, 1905, 301.

[8] *Das A.T. im Lichte des alten Orients* (1904), ^{2}1906, 82, n. 4 [Eng. trans. i. 90, n. 1]. Also Robertson, *Pagan Christs*, ^{2}1911, 220, thinks ultimately of Babylonian influence, but supposes it to proceed from the doctrine of the divine name.

therefore occupy us much longer than the doctrine of creation through the word.

(β) *Intermediary Beings.*—Alongside of God, and still more in God's stead, beings resembling Him, and particularly angels, are referred to in numerous passages of the New Testament. Doubtless these beings do not, generally speaking, play an important part: it is only in the Book of Revelation that they become very prominent—clearly under the influence of Judaism, to which this work is more indebted than any other in the New Testament. Angels have there, in fact, an extraordinary significance, even more than in the earlier religion of Israel or the religion of the prophets. But already in Ezekiel they come more definitely to the front, still more so in Zechariah, and most of all in Judaic thought. In it different groups of angels are differentiated, some even receive distinct names, in short, we have a regular angelology.

And yet this fact, as we have already indicated, can be traced completely and primarily to a development within Judaism, viz. to the evolution of transcendentalism in its doctrine of God. At the same time, there was a reanimation of primitive polydaemonistic ideas, which had been preserved among the common people and have been preserved even in later times, in fact down to the present day. It may be, too, that foreign ideas of a similar character have had some influence: for Judaism actually came into contact with such beliefs.

The operation of this influence is most frequently accepted in reference to the doctrine of the angels who stand before God or His throne (Lk $1^{19.\ 26}$, Rev 1^{4} 8^{2}), or the seven spirits of God whom Jesus hath (3^{1}). These two classes are without doubt the same originally; and with the latter class the seven lamps before God's throne (4^{5}) and the seven eyes of the Lamb (5^{6}) are to be identified. Already in Jewish thought these angels are to be found: in To 12^{15} Raphael is called one of the seven angels who have access to the glory of the Holy One; in Enoch, chap. 20 (according to the Greek text, at any rate), all the seven are enumerated; and the Testament of Levi (chap. 8) knows them also. Even in Ezekiel (chap. 9) there appear seven angels, in whom, accord-

ingly, Bertholet,[1] Gunkel,[2] Zimmern,[3] Bousset,[4] Jeremias,[5] see the earliest trace of what were afterwards called archangels.

Gunkel, who is followed by the three scholars last mentioned, traces these seven angels in Ezekiel, each of whom holds a "slaughter weapon" in his hand, to the seven planets distinguished by the Babylonians (Sun, Moon, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn). These, he says, were frequently represented, armed with weapons, most clearly on the rocks at Maltaya (Fig. 1). The one who is clothed in linen and has a writer's ink-horn by his side he connects with Nabû, the god of knowledge and writing, who is associated with the planet Mercury. Again, the fact that this angel stands "in the midst" of the others is explained in this way, that in the arrangement of the planets which underlies our designation of the days of the week, Mercury must have stood in the middle. As Zimmern[6] points out, this arrangement cannot be shown to have existed among the Babylonians: nevertheless the explanation might otherwise be correct. However, as again Zimmern[7] himself admits, not only is there no representation of the planet-gods on the rocks at Maltaya, but they are absolutely nowhere depicted together. Accordingly one need not trace the seven angels in Ezekiel to them; and, in fact, Nabû is the inscribing god in a different sense from the angel here. The latter is to mark those who are to be spared: Nabû, on the other hand, inscribes the tablets of fate, and thereby fixes destinies. Again, to continue this last topic, the conception of the book of life, which we meet in Ph 4^3, Rev 3^5 13^8 17^8 $20^{12.\ 15}$ 21^{27} (cp. Lk 10^{20}), is certainly traceable to Babylonian thought; and if in the Slavonic Book of Enoch $22^{11ff.}$ one of the archangels is characterized in a way similar to Nabû, this god,

[1] *Das Buch Hesekiel*, 1897, 51; *Daniel u. die griechische Gefahr*, 1907, 55.

[2] *Schöpfung u. Chaos*, 296, n. 1; "Der Schreiberengel Nabû im A.T. u. im Judentum," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1898, 294 ff.; *Zum religionsgeschichtl. Verständnis des N.T.s*, 1903, 40.

[3] *Die Keilinschriften und das A.T.*, 404, 624 f.

[4] *Offenbarung*, 292; *Religion*, 374.

[5] *Das A.T. im Lichte des alten Orients*, 126, 589 [Eng. trans. i. 139, ii. 293]; *Babylonisches im N.T.*, 24.

[6] *Keilinschriften*, 624.

[7] *Ibid.* 621.

perhaps alongside of the Egyptian Thot, may possibly have served as the model. Even for Ezekiel, chap. 9, this account may be accepted: but that does not yet explain the heptad of angels, the point with which we are here chiefly concerned. Certainly that heptad does not come, as H. Duhm [1] maintains, merely from "the endeavour . . . to bring system and order into the world of spirits," but has a more definite reason: what that is, we cannot yet say.

We are brought a step further by Zec $4^{2ff.}$, where the seven lamps on the seven-branched candlestick which the prophet perceives, are identified with the eyes of Jahweh, that run to and fro through the whole earth (cp. also 3^{9}); for the expression "eyes of God" is a very obvious designation for stars, and is therefore to be found elsewhere.[2] In that case, however, the seven-branched candlestick in the temple (Ex $25^{31ff.}$) ought also to represent these, and likewise the seven candlesticks, lamps, eyes of the Lamb, and the seven angels or spirits of the Book of Revelation with whom those first three groups are identified ($1^{4.\ 12.\ 20}$ 2^{1} 3^{1} 4^{5} 5^{6} 8^{2}). Again, in $1^{16.\ 20}$ 2^{1} there is express mention of seven stars which the Son of Man holds in His right hand: these stars, therefore, are the primary explanation of those other groups which appear in similar relationships.

But what stars are intended? Dupuis,[3] Richter,[4] and the majority of the modern scholars already named think of the so-called seven planets enumerated above. Gunkel,[5] however, regards it as possible that the seven stars of 1^{16} are the stars of the Little Bear, which Mithras—in the liturgy edited by Dieterich [6]—is described as holding in his hand. Jeremias [7]

[1] *Die bösen Geister im A.T.*, 1904, 55, n. 1.

[2] Cp. Gruppe, *Mythologie*, 380; Gressmann, *Ursprung*, 108, n. 1.

[3] *Origine*, iii. 211 f. [4] *Christentum*, 207 f.

[5] *Verständnis*, 40, n. 3. Bousset, *Offenbarung*, 196, is not altogether precise on this point. He says first, "The figure here presented . . . belongs at all events to the same category as the seven spirits, candlesticks, lamps, eyes" (which he interprets as the planets). But then he proceeds, "It may, however, be mentioned that in the '*Mithras-liturgy*' edited by Dieterich, the god Mithras appears to the mystagogue κατέχ[ων] τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ μόσχου ὦμον χρύσεον, ὅς ἐστιν ἄρκτος. . . . The seven stars form one constellation."

[6] *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (1903), [2]1910, 14, 72, 76 f.

[7] *Babylonisches*, 24, n. 4.

rejects this theory, and explains the seven stars as the Pleiades (as Dupuis[1] had already explained the seven angels in chap. 15). Zimmern[2] also points out "that this heptad forms in Babylonian mythology a much closer unity than the planet-deities. This is only natural, inasmuch as the Pleiades at once strike the eye as a unity, whereas the combination of Sun, Moon, and the five planets in one group is based on reflection." But even in Zimmern's own opinion this is indecisive: and there is as little to be said for Jeremias' argument that the Pleiades belong to Taurus, and Taurus—so one must suppose, in order to understand the reasoning at all —originally represents the Messiah; for the last statement is by no means demonstrable. But, above all, the seven stars must originally denote the same as the other groups of seven, and *they* can only be understood of the so-called planets.

In reaching this conclusion, I attach no particular weight to the circumstance that Philo (*Quis Rer. Div. Haer.* 44, ed. Mangey, i. 504) and Josephus (*BJ* v. 5. 5, *Ant.* iii. 6. 7, 7. 7) give this explanation of the seven-branched candlestick: for it was perhaps only conjecture on their part, as Zimmern[3] supposes. Further, "no great stress should probably be laid on the late-Jewish traditions which connect the seven archangels with the seven heavens (which are situated below the seven planets), or associate them severally with the days of the week and the planets corresponding to them": and equally little stress on the description given of these last as the seven stars in the Slavonic Book of Enoch 27^3 30^3. On the other hand, it seems to me a decisive argument, that one can understand of the planets, and only of the planets, how they are referred to as candlesticks, as lamps, as spirits that stand before God or spirits that Jesus hath, and as eyes of the Lamb; and how they could thereby be ranked as subordinate to God and Jesus (or the Lamb).

But at this point the prevailing idea that all such reasoning is polemic against the Babylonian religion, has to meet a new difficulty, to which Anz[4] was the first to call

[1] *Origine*, iii. 265. [2] *Keilinschriften*, 620 f. [3] *Ibid.* 625.
[4] "Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus," *Texte u. Unters.* xv. 4, 1897, 65.

attention. "Nowhere," he says, "are the seven planet-gods named as a single aggregate, still less were hymns addressed to them in that aspect. It is only in erudite lists that we find them so combined." The fact that these lists, as Hehn[1] observes, date only from the time of Assurbanipal, is negligible, though Gunkel[2] and Zimmern's[3] statement that even the ten (!) candlesticks of Solomon's temple (1 K 7^{49}) were seven-branched and signified the planets, cannot in my opinion be proved. On the other hand, it is again very remarkable that, according to Hehn, the combination of the seven planets in one group is not at all a central idea of Babylonian religion. And yet it must have been so in later times, as Bousset[4] proves. This is shown by the well-known statement of Diodorus (*Bibl. Hist.* ii. 30 f.); and it may be inferred from the religion of the Ṣabians, a form of planet-worship, which we find later in Mesopotamia and must trace to Babylonian religion; or again from Gnosticism with its archons who correspond to the planets—and in its earliest form Gnosticism perhaps also originated in the Babylonian lowlands. But the chief evidence lies in the part assigned to the planets in Mithraism,[5] whereas in the Bundahis (3. 25, 5. 1, *Sacred Books of the East*, v. 19, 21 f.) and also in Mandaeism they are considered as subordinate to the most high God. And in this we have at the same time an analogy to, perhaps a prototype of, the degradation of the planets in Judaism and early Christianity.

But has Christianity any perception of the original meaning of the seven spirits? Certain scholars believe that it has, and attempt in this way to explain in the first instance the various designations of Jesus in the letters to the seven Churches (Rev. 2 f.), or even the characterizations of these Churches.

This mode of treatment is followed by Dupuis,[6] who, however, at the same time connects the planets with the

[1] "Siebenzahl u. Sabbat bei den Babyloniern u. im A.T.," *Lpz. semit. Studien*, ii. 5, 1907, 46.
[2] *Schöpfung*, 129.
[3] *Keilinschriften*, 626.
[4] *Hauptprobleme*, 22 ff.
[5] Cp. Cumont, *Textes*, i. 299 f.
[6] *Origine*, iii. 224 ff.

signs of the Zodiac—a point which here may be passed over. The angel of the Church of Ephesus, the city of Diana, he identifies with the moon, and explains thereby the circumstance that it is said of him that he hates the works of the Nicolaitans: immorality conflicts with the chastity of Diana. The angel of the Church in Thyatira, on the other hand, is Venus—"*I will give him the morning star*" are the words of v.[28]; therefore the angel is reproached with suffering Jezebel to commit fornication. "Si nous passons à la dernière église (3[15]) et à son Génie tutélaire, nous y reconnoîtrons presque tous les traits, que l'Astrologie donnoit au vieux Saturne, vieillard lent et glacé. Firmicus (*Math.* iii. 5) parlant des influences planétaires, dit de Saturne qu'il rend les hommes lents et avares; ailleurs, qu'il est froid, obscur, réduit à la plus grande indigence. L'auteur de l'Apocalypse (3[16f.]) dit de l'Ange ou du Génie tutélaire de la dernière Église qu'il est nud, pauvre, aveugle; et il lui reproche sa tiédeur."[1] Dupuis supposes that future inquiries will establish connexions between the remaining planets and Churches as well: for the present we shall regard those that he has discovered as merely imaginary.

Winckler[2] and Jeremias,[3] however, associate the designations of Jesus with the seven planets. "*He that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, he that walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks*" (2[1])—that is the Sun; for it corresponds, says Jeremias, to Marduk, as he does to Taurus, to which the Pleiades (indicated by the seven stars) belong. "*The first and the last, which was dead and lived again*" (v.[8])—that is, of course, the Moon; "*he that hath the sharp two-edged sword*" (v.[12])—that is, for a reason that will be mentioned subsequently, Mars; "*the Son of God, who hath his eyes like a flame of fire, and his feet are like unto burnished brass*" (v.[18])—Mercury-Nebo, the son of Marduk; "flame of fire and burnished brass are appropriate to him, seeing that he is the very image of Marduk, to whom he corresponds in the Equinox"; "*he that hath the seven spirits of God, and the seven stars*" (3[1])—Jupiter-Marduk, the most high God; "*he*

[1] *Origine*, iii. 225 f.
[2] *Altorientalische Forschungen*, ii., 1901, 389.
[3] *Babylonisches*, 26 f.

that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and none shall shut, and that shutteth and none openeth" (v.[7])—Venus-Ishtar the wife of Tammuz, or Tammuz himself; finally, "*the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God*" (v.[14])—Saturn. There is no need to point out in detail how artificial and far-fetched this parallelization is: the various designations of Jesus are explained, as Bousset [1] shows, at any rate in the second, third, sixth, and seventh cases, much more naturally by the circumstances of the Churches in question.

The corresponding explanation of the seven seals and trumpets in $6^{1ff.}$ $8^{2ff.}$ is still more unsuccessful. Brandis,[2] without adducing further reasons, connected the first of the seals with the Moon; Winckler [3] and Jeremias [4] again arrange the others alongside of those planets which among the Babylonians are characterized by a colour identical with, or similar to, that named in the Apocalypse. But in the case of the seventh seal there is no colour mentioned at all—for the golden altar and the golden censer (8^{3}) have nothing to do with the seals. Perhaps one should not attach much importance to this: for it is certain that originally the seventh seal denotes something else—the opening of it merely occasions a silence for the space of half an hour, because still other signs are to follow. But independently of this, the colours named in relation to the other seals are not in direct correspondence with those generally associated with the planets. For the colours for the planets are the following: silver, dark blue, pale yellow, golden, rosy red, brown red, black; [5] in the Apocalypse, on the other hand, white, red, black, yellow, again white and again black. Still more artificial is the further interpretation of the seven seals, according to which one planet is substituted for another: we shall see later how these ideas and images have actually arisen. A cognate topic may be mentioned here. Winckler [6] and

[1] *Offenbarung*, 208 ff.
[2] "Die Bedeutung der sieben Tore Thebens," *Hermes*, 1867, 283.
[3] *Forschungen*, ii. 386 f. [4] *Babylonisches*, 24 ff.
[5] Cp. Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 616, n. 7, 617, n. 1.
[6] *Forschungen*, ii. 387.

Jeremias[1] explain the term *Βοανηργές* (applied in Mk 3^{17} to the sons of Zebedee) in this way, that in place of Jupiter, who in Babylonian was called Zalbatanu—and from that the name Zebedee is alleged to have come—Saturn-Nergal or Nerig has been substituted. But even if the last name really existed,[2] all this is, at any rate, less probable than the other explanations of the term, inadequate though they may be. Besides, we should at once discover, in this the first instance we have met of an astral-mythological explanation of the narrative, how difficult it is in such a matter to separate form and content.[3]

In the Apocalypse, finally, Winckler[4] associates some of the trumpets, and Jeremias[5] all of them, with the planets. "The destruction of everything green on the earth at the sound of the first trumpet," writes the latter, "is an allusion to the moon, which is the lord of all verdure. At the sound of the second trumpet, the mention of fire and blood which destroy everything living in the sea, points to Mars; at the third trumpet a star (!) falls from heaven (Mercury?) and turns a third part of the waters to wormwood. At the fourth trumpet-call the presence of the eagle announces the Jupiter-motif; at the fifth there falls again a star from heaven (cp. Is $14^{12ff.}$ '*How art thou fallen from heaven, O day star, son of the morning!*'), which opens the entrance (fountain) of the underworld. Here we have the same motif of Venus-Ishtar-Tammuz as in the case of the fifth seal, $6^{9ff.}$. The horses with heads of lions and tails like serpents, that appear at the sound of the sixth trumpet, are to be explained as the retinue of Nergal. The seventh trumpet-call announces again the apotheosis: the kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of the Lord and of his Christ." Once more there is no need to show in detail that none of these interpretations is conclusive: the attempt to prove that Babylonian teaching in regard to the planets has influenced any but the first-quoted passages from the Apocalypse must, although even

[1] *Babylonisches*, 24 ff.
[2] Cp. Brandt, *Mandäische Schriften*, 1893, 45, n. 12.
[3] Cp. also Wilke, *Die astralmythologische Weltanschauung*, 33 f.
[4] *Forschungen*, ii. 388.
[5] *Babylonisches*, 26.

Zimmern[1] admits that influence in the case of the seals, be described as an utter failure.

The writer of the Apocalypse then is no longer conscious of the original meaning of the spirits, candlesticks, lamps, stars, and eyes of which he speaks: otherwise he could not have treated these "existences" [*Grössen*], which are really identical, as distinct from one another. And this being so, when Paul says in Col 2^{15} that God put off from Himself the principalities and the powers and made a show of them openly, it is improbable—Bousset[2] notwithstanding—that he thinks of that subjugation of the planets to which we have already referred. But in view of the unconsciousness of the Apocalyptic writer, it is not impossible that the seven angels may be traced, quite apart from any connexion with the Babylonian planets, to the Amesha Spentas who surround Ahura Mazda. This is the theory put forward by Gunkel,[3] Stave,[4] Beer,[5] O. Pfleiderer,[6] Zimmern,[7] Bousset,[8] Bertholet;[9] and, in fact, the doctrine of the Amesha Spentas was already known in pre-Christian times. It is true that where it is mentioned by Plutarch (*De Is.* 47), he does not appeal expressly to Theopompus; but, as we have seen (p. 27), others even then know of it. Accordingly that theory would in itself be possible; for there is little probability in the view still accepted by Oldenberg[10]—in addition to the other scholars already named, who no doubt have expressed themselves with varying definiteness—that the Amesha Spentas are to be traced in turn to the seven Babylonian planets, and that this explanation, therefore, merges in the previous one. For the Amesha Spentas are originally abstract ideas, hardly personified, which have nothing to do with stars; and if their number should remind one of the seven Babylonian planets,

[1] *Keilinschriften*, 626.
[2] *Hauptprobleme*, 54.
[3] *Schöpfung*, 302, n. 1; *Verständnis*, 42.
[4] *Einfluss*, 217.
[5] In E. Kautzsch's *Die Apokryphen u. Pseudepigraphen des A.T.s*, 1900, ii. 251.
[6] *Urchristentum*, ii. 285, 288 [Eng. trans. iii. 405 f., 409].
[7] *Keilinschriften*, 625.
[8] *Offenbarung*, 186, 292; *Religion*, 569 f.
[9] *Daniel*, 55 f.
[10] *Die Religion des Veda*, 1894, 193 ff.; "Zu Mythologie u. Kultus des Veda," *Zeitschr. d. d. morg. Ges.*, 1895, 177 f.; "Varuna u. die Adityas," *ibid.* 1896, 43 ff.

we have already seen that the sacred character of that number is not at all invariably traceable to them.[1] Indeed, the Amesha Spentas were not always seven in number. Originally there were only six—for the idea of putting Ahura Mazda on an equality with them, though as *primus inter pares*, cannot have arisen at the very first, when he stood high above them.[2] If this be granted, and if the remarks just made on the original character of the Amesha Spentas be true, the alleged influence of this teaching on the Judaeo-Christian speculation in question becomes again doubtful. Following the example of Kohut,[3] some scholars, it is true, have endeavoured to find in the various statements regarding the number of the Amesha Spentas the explanation of the similar uncertainty in Jewish literature regarding the number of the archangels; and, in fact, Jewish teaching in regard to archangels may in this and other[4] respects have been subsequently influenced by the Persian doctrine. But it is probable that originally—at any rate in the form that alone concerns us here, the form which it displays in the New Testament—it is derived from the Babylonian worship of the planets. For if on monuments relating to Mithraism, Ormazd also frequently appears surrounded by other gods,[5] and if, according to Minucius Felix (*Oct.* 26), "*Magorum et eloquio et negotio primus Hostanes . . . angelos, id est ministros et nuntios Dei, . . . eius venerationi novit assistere*,"[6] these statements and representations are probably too late to afford any trustworthy explanation.

It must be admitted that the names of the archangels (which would prove the correctness of the proposed theory, and must therefore be discussed here) are not capable of

[1] Cp. also Tiele, *Geschichte der Religion im Altertum*, ii., 1903, 70 f., 126 f. The opposite theory of L. H. Gray, "The Double Nature of the Iranian Archangels," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1904, 345 ff., seems to me not to be proved.

[2] Cp. Tiele, *Geschichte*, ii. 140.

[3] "Über die jüd. Angelologie u. Dämonologie," *Abhandlungen d. d. morg. Ges.* iv. 3, 1866, 3, n. 9.

[4] Cp. also A. V. W. Jackson, "A Brief Note on the Amshaspands, or a Contribution to Zoroastrian Angelology," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1898, 363 ff.; Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 1904, 280, n. 4.

[5] Cp. Cumont, *Textes*, i. 129; *Les religions orientales*, 325.

[6] For later passages to the same effect, see Cumont, *ibid.* 306.

being explained in this way, although Jewish tradition (*Jer. Rosh Hash.* 56*a*; *Bereshi. Rab.* 48) alleges that they come from Babylonia. In the New Testament only two are mentioned, and therefore come within our purview. They are Gabriel and Michael, the former of whom is named in Lk $1^{19.\ 26}$, the latter in Rev 12^{7} and Jude ^{9}. Further, the archangel who will lift up his voice at the second coming of Jesus, and (according to the probable interpretation) will blow the trumpet (1 Th 4^{16}, cp. 1 Co 15^{52}), is, as Bousset[1] and Lueken[2] show, to be identified with Michael; whether (as Lueken[3] supposes) there are veiled references to him in some other New Testament passages, is a question that may here be passed over, all the more as we shall return on a subsequent page to one of these (Ph 2^{6}). In any case, neither the one name nor the other is to be derived from Babylonia. Kessler,[4] it is true, connects Gabriel with one of the ten early kings referred to in Berosus' account (in Eusebius, *Chron.*, ed. Schöne, i. 7 ff., 31 f.); but this identification is quite uncertain: and Michael might even more probably be a Jewish name. Further, the conceptions of Michael that we find in the New Testament and even at an earlier time are probably, as Bousset[5] believes, the work of distinctively Jewish imagination, and not to be derived (as Cheyne[6] derives them) from Babylonia or Persia. Still there is one idea which possibly shows the working of a foreign collateral influence. As we shall see later, Michael in Rev 12^{7} is originally thought of as the guardian angel of Israel, as in Daniel ($10^{13.\ 20f.}$ 11^{1} 12^{1}), in Enoch (20^{5}), and in the Rabbis.[7] That is not explained by the old belief in national gods, which is the basis of the passage in Dt $32^{8f.}$, running thus (according to the Greek, and certainly the original, text): ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς

[1] *Der Antichrist*, 1895, 167 [Eng. trans., *The Antichrist Legend*, 1896, 248 f.]; *Religion*, 376.

[2] *Michael*, 1898, 50, 130.

[3] *Ibid.* 137, 139, 148; cp. also Bousset, *Antichrist*, 151 [Eng. trans. 227 f.].

[4] "Mandäische Probleme nach ihrer religionsgesch. Bedeutung," *Verhandlungen des II. Kongr. f. Rel.-Gesch.* 256 ff.; also art. "Mandäer," *Prot. Realencykl.*[3] xii., 1903, 166.

[5] *Religion*, 570.

[6] *Bible Problems*, 1904, 223 ff.; "The Archangel Michael in the Light of Criticism," *Expositor*, 1906, 7th ser., i. 297 ff.

[7] Cp. Lueken, *Michael*, 15 ff.

Ἀδάμ, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ. Καὶ ἐγενήθη μερὶς Κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ, σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ Ἰσραήλ (cp. Sir 17^{17}). This being so, Stave [1] believes that the idea of the guardian angel (of a nation) must necessarily come from foreign influences, and, in fact, since Babylonian religion certainly offers no parallel,[2] from the influences of Parsism. But even there we have not the conception of the guardian angels of separate peoples, but there are "the awful Fravashis of the faithful, many and many hundreds, many and many thousands, many and many tens of thousands," who, according to *Yt.* 13. 66, 68 (*Sacred Books*, xxiii. 196), in times of danger exclaim, "*May our own country have a good store and full joy! May my country grow and increase!*" Besides, there is no need of such a foreign prototype for the Judaeo-Christian idea of guardian angels of all the different nations; the general belief, however, in guardian angels may be partially traced to foreign influences. But it would be premature to speak of this here.

Moffatt [3] would connect also the angel of Rev 14^{18}, who calls to another with a sharp sickle and has himself power over fire, with one of the Amesha Spentas, Asha Vahista, the spirit of fire; but though that angel comes out from the altar spoken of in 8^{3} after the mention of the angels who stand before God, there is no need in chap. 14 to think of one of these. On the contrary, in the passage just cited, still another angel, quite distinct from these, comes to the altar; and if the one mentioned in 14^{18} does not require to be identified with him, there is less need to connect him with Asha Vahista. His power over fire is explained, I think, by the circumstance that he comes out from the altar.

But it is probable that the two passages in the Apocalypse in which the morning star is spoken of, viz. 2^{28}, where it is promised to him that overcometh, and 22^{16}, where Christ is so named, are in some way connected with Babylonian planet-worship. Moffatt [4] believes, further, that since in the following verse the water of life is mentioned, the Persian idea of the star Tistrya, the seed of water (*Yt.* 8. 4, 12. 29;

[1] *Einfluss*, 225 f.
[2] Cp. Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 454 f.
[3] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1903–4, ii. 350 f.
[4] *Ibid.* 348.

Sacred Books, xxiii. 94, 175), is presupposed; but, apart from all other arguments, we may point out that it is Sirius that is there referred to!

Some other "existences" may be mentioned at this point, which no doubt appear only in the Apocalypse, but which, being also derived from Babylonian astronomy, may render the alleged origin of the seven spirits and similar aggregates one degree more probable. First of all, we read in 4^4 of four and twenty elders who sit on thrones around the throne of God. There are similar passages in Is 24^{23} "*The Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his elders gloriously*"; and in Slavonic Enoch 4^1 (where, however, the text is not absolutely trustworthy) "*They brought before my face the elders and the rulers of the orders of the stars.*" If the text were trustworthy, the passage would at once carry us farther: but, independently of this, it is obvious that the four and twenty elders in the Book of Revelation are angels—in later writings they are still more evidently characterized as such;[1] and in view of our conclusions regarding the seven spirits, it is probable that they originally signify stars. In that case this conception also would be of foreign origin, and this harmonizes, at any rate, with the circumstance that we meet it only in post-exilic times, the period to which Is 24 ff. is known to belong. More definitely, Dupuis[2] identifies them with the twenty-four hours of the day, Nork[3] with the twenty-four half-months of the year, which were, he says, like time, represented by aged men. But this cannot be proved: on the other hand (as Gunkel[4] has again been the first to point out), Diodorus (*Bibl. Hist.* ii. 31) expressly states regarding the Babylonians: μετὰ τὸν ζῳδιακὸν κύκλον εἴκοσιν καὶ τέτταρας ἀφορίζουσιν ἀστέρας, ὧν τοὺς μὲν ἡμίσεις ἐν τοῖς βορείοις μέρεσι, τοὺς δ' ἡμίσεις ἐν τοῖς νοτίοις τετάχθαι φασί, καὶ τούτων τοὺς μὲν ὁρωμένους τῶν ζώντων εἶναι καταριθμοῦσι, τοὺς δ' ἀφανεῖς τοῖς τετελευτηκόσι προσωρίσθαι νομίζουσιν, οὓς δικαστὰς τῶν

[1] Cp. Bousset, *Offenbarung*, 247, n. 3; Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 301.
[2] *Origine*, iii. 230, 241.
[3] *Biblische Mythologie des A. u. N.T.s*, 1842, 178.
[4] *Schöpfung*, 308.

ὅλων προσαγορεύουσιν. Jeremias[1] makes only "the invisible ones" the antecedent of this last relative clause; but since the designation δικασταὶ τῶν ὅλων is not at all appropriate to them, this view is certainly incorrect: the designation belongs to all the twenty-four stars, which the Babylonians—for what reasons we need not here discuss—have evidently distinguished. At the same time, Parsism also seems to have contained a similar speculation: at any rate, Plutarch says (*De Is.* 47) that according to Magian teaching Horomazes had, in addition to those six (see p. 92), created twenty-four other gods. But apart from this passage we cannot yet prove the existence of the belief. It is true that Windischmann[2] says: "The four and twenty other gods are the Yazatas, the number of whom is variously stated. Twenty of them, in addition to Ahura Mazda and the six Amesha Spentas, give their names to the days of the month (cp. *Ys.* 16. 3 ff.). Others can easily be found, *e.g.* Nairyô-sangha, Airyama-ishyô, Anâhita (if she is not already included in Water), Haoma, and the like"; and Jackson[3] says: "Theoretically the number of the Yazatas is legion. . . . In reality, however, the only prominent Yazatas are those to whom one day in the month is set apart as a feast-day, or for whose worship a particular time of the year or a special form is appointed. Plutarch is not far from the truth when he speaks of twenty-four gods—for this is approximately the number we reach if we take the thirty days of the month and then deduct seven for Ormazd and the six Amshaspands." But earlier evidence is wanting, as it is wanting also for the idea of the world-egg, which Plutarch discusses immediately afterwards, and which Windischmann[4] can discover only in Maînôg-î Khirad, 44. 79 f. (*Sacred Books*, xxiv. 84 f.).[5]

In preference to this view, therefore, we shall find our explanation of the elders of the Apocalypse in Babylonian religion; for the further circumstance that in 4^{10} they cast their crowns before the throne has no connexion, such as

[1] *Babylonisches*, 15, n. 4. [2] *Zoroastrische Studien*, 1863, 284.
[3] In Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss*, ii. 641.
[4] *Studien*, 284; cp. also Cumont, *Textes*, i. 163, n. 2.
[5] Cp. also Jackson in Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss*, ii. 671 f.

Moffatt[1] suggests, with the later custom of the worshippers of Mithras who refused to be crowned; or with the statement of Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 29), quoted by Wetstein[2] and Bousset,[3] that Tiridates, whom we shall encounter on a later page as a worshipper of Mithras, deposited his diadem before the image of Nero.

When in $4^{6f.}$ we read: "*Before the throne, as it were a glassy sea like unto crystal; and in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, four living creatures full of eyes before and behind. And the first creature was like a lion, and the second creature like a calf, and the third creature had a face as of a man, and the fourth creature was like a flying eagle*" —this, of course, recalls the well-known vision of Ezk $1^{5ff.}$ (cp. $10^{1ff.}$), but is not thereby explained. In the Book of Revelation, however, where the author probably thinks of the brazen sea in the temple, there is before the throne (in Ezekiel *over* it) a sea of glass, *i.e.* the ocean of heaven;[4] and the living creatures, in Ezekiel also the wheels, are full of eyes, which we were already compelled to identify with stars; and, finally, we have just seen that the elders are stars.[5] These circumstances suggest that by the living creatures also we are to understand stars, or, more precisely, constellations. And, in fact, the Babylonians, to whom Ezekiel and the Apocalypse are here also in the last resort indebted, were acquainted with the constellation Taurus, and perhaps also with Leo.[6] Since

[1] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1903–4, ii. 351.

[2] *Nov. Test.* ii. 767.

[3] *Offenbarung*, 253.

[4] In the same way in Rev 15^{2}; cp. also 21^{21}, and on this Bousset, *Offenbarung*, 392, 450; further, Miss A. Grenfell, "Egyptian Mythology and the Bible," *Monist*, 1906, 183, writes: "Dr. Budge has drawn attention to the remarkable fact that the throne of Osiris, in a vignette of the Hunefer papyrus (*c.* 1370 B.C.), is represented as placed on water. The Book of the Dead mentions the water beneath the throne of Osiris, in chapters cxvii. and cxxv."

[5] Bousset, *Offenbarung*, 252, n. 3, thinks that perhaps the lightnings, voices, and thunders which, according to Rev. 4^{5}, proceed out of the throne, are to be explained as the music of the spheres—as Gunkel, *Verständnis*, 47, would explain the noise of the living creatures' wings in Ezk 1^{24}. But this is very problematical.

[6] Cp. Jensen, *Die Kosmologie der Babylonier*, 1890, 62 ff., 66; also *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1902, 371: "Though in the interval my conjecture that UR-GU-LA is a designation for Leo in the Zodiac has been confirmed, still my reading A[rū] for

both of these belong to the Zodiac, and the Zodiac was, as we have already seen, likewise known to the Babylonians—though this does not imply that they had already given the later names to all the signs—it was thought that the explanation of the man and the eagle could be found there as well. Dupuis,[1] Nork,[2] and perhaps Jeremias,[3] identified the man with Aquarius, who is, in fact, about ninety degrees distant from Taurus, as Taurus is from Leo. As Jensen[4] shows, however, Aquarius is of Western origin, and "to judge by Eastern appellations, we should probably in the Chaldaean chart . . . look only for an amphora." Accordingly Zimmern,[5] Gunkel,[6] and Bousset[7] think rather of the "Scorpion-man," that being the name applied by the Babylonians to the Scorpion, which faces Taurus, and perhaps to other constellations[8] (Fig. 2). In that case, the eagle also may be identified with the constellation Aquila—although such a name, so far as I am aware, is not yet known to have existed in Babylonia,[9] and Aquila is not exactly opposite to Leo. Zimmern explains the choice made of it by the fact that Aquarius contains no stars of special brightness, whereas Aquila, like Taurus, Leo, and Scorpio, contains one star of the first magnitude. But it is perhaps more natural, and even Zimmern regards it as possible, to identify the eagle with Pegasus, the winged steed, which directly faces Leo. Pegasus was most probably known to the

the letter A, which likewise refers to the Lion, must remain hypothetical so long as there is no actual evidence in Assyrian remains of an arū with that meaning."

[1] *Origine*, iii. 234. [2] *Mythologie*, 177.

[3] *Das A.T.* 25 [Eng. trans. i. 27]. But in *Babylonisches*, 15, n. 3, he says, "The text must be corrupt"—without entering into details. Further, in *Das A.T.* 582 [Eng. trans. ii. 285 f.] he says with reference to Ezk 1: "They are not, however, four signs of the Zodiac, but the representatives of the divine power at the four 'ends of the earth.'" Here also, then, Jeremias' real opinion is not clear.

[4] *Kosmologie*, 81; cp. *Das Gilgameschepos in der Weltliteratur*, i., 1906, 93, n. 2; also Boll, *Sphaera*, 1903, 204, 207, and *Bund.* 2. 2 (*Sacred Books of the East*, v. 11).

[5] *Keilinschriften*, 632. [6] *Verständnis*, 47.

[7] *Offenbarung*, 251 f. [8] Cp. especially Boll, *Sphaera*, 195 f.

[9] We have probably not to think of the raven or bird of prey that is often represented on so-called boundary stones, for according to Boll, *ibid.* 206, the texts furnish direct evidence of the raven as a Babylonian constellation.

Babylonians,[1] and also exhibits a star of the first magnitude. The circumstance that neither Aquila nor Pegasus lies in the Ecliptic, should not disturb us; it is, as Boll[2] says, "indeed very probable that the less remarkable constellations, *e.g.* Aries, received their names only in the course of time, and that previously the corresponding twelfths of the ecliptic were indicated by conspicuous constellations lying somewhat to the North or South." There is therefore no need for Jeremias'[3] curious explanation: "Perhaps four thousand years ago Aquila was situated within the belt of the Zodiac; in consequence of nutation of the earth's axis the belt of the Zodiac has been altered in the course of the centuries." (One should rather say "of the ecliptic"; but even that is not to be admitted for historical times.) Still less need is there for Dupuis'[4] hypothesis, that Aquila was substituted for Scorpio because the latter had a sinister meaning; or Nork's[5] idea, that the claws of Scorpio were transformed into wings![6] And it is even more inept to compare the four living creatures, as finally Miss A. Grenfell[7] does, with the four Egyptian funerary genii, though these, we must admit, are called the pillars of the God Shu, *i.e.* of heaven. But when all has been said, even the theory here advocated can only be called probable; for we know nothing of any special importance attached to those four constellations among the Babylonians. Zimmern,[8] it is true, supposes that the winged figures so frequently depicted in Babylonian-Assyrian representations on both sides of the "sacred tree" are almost certainly personifications of the winds, which carry the fertilizing principle from the male date-palm to the female. These figures, as a rule, had human heads and a human body, but often also the heads of eagles with a human body, and now and then a human head with a lion's body

[1] Cp. Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 88 ff. [2] *Sphaera*, 186.
[3] *Das A.T.* 25, n. 2 [modified in Eng. trans. i. 27, n. 2].
[4] *Origine*, iii. 238 f. [5] *Mythologie*, 177.
[6] Winckler, *Forschungen*, iii. 2. 297, says: "The eagle must on our hypothesis represent the autumnal equinox; that is to say, when the spring begins with Taurus, the eagle must correspond to Sagittarius." But this is, I think, merely an inadvertence: it is *Scorpio* that is opposite Taurus.
[7] *Monist*, 1906, 184 ff. [8] *Keilinschriften*, 631.

(Figs. 3 and 4); they were therefore akin to the bull and lion colossi at the entrances to Assyrian temples and palaces, which had human heads and birds' wings combined with the bodies of bulls and lions. He concludes, therefore, that it is natural to suppose that the four living creatures represent the winds from the four quarters of heaven. One might further, with Gunkel,[1] point out that according to Ethiopic Enoch $18^{2f.}$ the four winds support the firmament of heaven, which is probably what is intended by the throne of God. But even this does not make the interpretation certain as a whole: however, for the reasons alleged it may be regarded as most probable, not only that the four living creatures are constellations, but also that they belonged to the earlier Babylonian Zodiac. Still, in another passage in Enoch ($82^{4ff.}$) there are four leaders spoken of, who, like the twelve to be mentioned below, might be signs of the Zodiac. On the other hand, there is a different signification to be attached to the four stars that play such an important rôle in Parsic doctrine (*Bund.* 2. 7; *Yt.* 8. 6, 8, 9, 12, 32, 35 ff., 39 ff., 48 f., 52 f., 55, 62, 12. 26 ff.; *Sir.* 13; *Sacred Books*, v. 12, xxiii. 9, 16, 94 ff., 175 ff.), and to which Bousset[2] still calls attention, although, with Gunkel,[3] he traces them to Babylonian religion: according to West,[4] they represent Ursa Major, Sirius, Fomalhaut, and Antares. But one may perhaps, with Bousset[5] and Gunkel,[6] point out not only that the Rabbis subsequently had their speculations regarding the chariot of Ezekiel, but that Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* xxxvi. 39 ff.) knows also of similar Magian theories regarding the chariot of Zeus. Thus the conception of the throne of God which we find in Ezekiel and in the Apocalypse appears to have been already in existence; and, in fact, we have representations of Babylonian deities that are at any rate comparable.[7]

[1] *Verständnis*, 46.
[2] *Religion*, 567; *Hauptprobleme*, 339.
[3] *Verständnis*, 8, n. 3.
[4] *Sacred Books*, v. 12 f.
[5] *Offenbarung*, 252; *Religion*, 408 f., 592, n. 5.
[6] *Verständnis*, 47, n. 2.
[7] Cp. *ibid.* 46, n. 4; Jeremias, *Das A.T.* 582, n. 2 [Eng. trans. ii. 285, n. 2]; further, Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 632, who says: "On a cylinder seal from ancient Babylon in the British Museum, there is a representation of a god who is being conveyed over the sea in a boat and who is seated on two beasts (bulls?

The signs of the Zodiac—to follow up this topic—have been discovered in two other passages in the Apocalypse. First of all, in the crown of twelve stars which the woman in 12[1] wears on her head; so Dupuis,[1] Gunkel,[2] Zimmern,[3] Bousset,[4] Jeremias.[5] The last of these scholars at the same time calls attention to the statement of Martianus Capella (*De Nupt. Philol. et Merc.* i. 75),[6] according to which the Assyrian Juno wore on her head a crown with twelve precious stones; and some of them at any rate (emerald, jasper, hyacinth) appear also among those with which in the Apocalypse (21[19f.]) the foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem are adorned, or of which they actually consist. These precious stones, however, are precisely the same as those which Kircher,[7] in a survey of the subject based on Egyptian and Arabian monuments, regarded as corresponding to the twelve signs of the Zodiac. And, in fact, it is probable that those foundations are ultimately the signs of the Zodiac, although the precious stones that constitute or adorn them could primarily be derived from Ezk 28[13ff.], Ex 28[17ff.] 39[10ff.]—but even these stones on the high priest's robe are identified by Philo (*Vit. Mos.* iii. 14, ed. Mangey, ii. 155) and Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 7. 7) with the signs of the Zodiac. The foundations, that is to say, are only a variant of the twelve gates of Rev 21[12ff.], which appear already in Ezekiel (48[30ff.]); over them there are twelve angels appointed, as in Ethiopic Enoch (72[2ff.] 75[4ff.] 82[4ff.]) over the gates of heaven, *i.e.* the signs of the Zodiac, which, as we have seen, the Babylonians

with human faces?) placed back to back. This representation first Lenormant (*Origines*, 119), and then, following him, Delitzsch [*Paradies*, 150, and *Babel u. Bibel*, 48 f. (Eng. trans. 73 f.)] and A. Jeremias (art. 'Marduk' in Roscher's *Lex.* ii. col. 2348) have connected with the *merkaba* of Jahweh in Ezk 1: but surely there is only a distant resemblance between them. Compare also Jensen in *Christl. Welt*, 1902, col. 490, who explains the Babylonian representation as that of the sun-god crossing the ocean. A parallel, which deserves mention here, may more easily be found in the . . . passage where Ishtar is spoken of as surrounded on four sides by four good genii."

[1] *Origine*, iii. 249, 308.
[2] *Schöpfung*, 386.
[3] *Keilinschriften*, 630; cp. 360, n. 3.
[4] *Offenbarung*, 336.
[5] *Babylonisches*, 35 f.
[6] Cp. also 67, and Nonnus, *Dionys.* xxxii. 10.
[7] *Oedipus Aegyptiacus*, ii. 2, 1653, 177 f.

already distinguished. To them, therefore, the twelve gates of the heavenly Jerusalem would correspond—and, in fact, they are divided among the four quarters of the heavens; just as the heavenly Jerusalem itself would correspond to the heavens—hence its cubic form and the river which flows through it, the Milky Way. But further discussion of this subject must be deferred: our object has merely been to show that the gates and foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem were originally the twelve signs of the Zodiac, a view accepted by Dupuis,[1] Zimmern,[2] Gunkel,[3] Bousset,[4] and Jeremias.[5]

The attempt to bring out a connexion between the twelve disciples of Jesus and the signs of the Zodiac is made by Winckler,[6] Jeremias,[7] and Fiebig,[8] who to this end make Alphaeus in Mk 3^{18} (and par.) correspond with Alpu, *i.e.* Taurus. Fiebig endeavours to justify this, and the explanation of Zebedee already mentioned, by the assertion that the names of fathers are not always intended in the genealogical sense, but sometimes have an underlying motif. The Old Testament proofs of this I do not discuss, as they are not for us *prima facie* conclusive; but can Simon really in Mt 16^{17} and Jn 1^{43} $21^{15ff.}$ be called the son of Jonas or John only because, according to Ac $9^{39ff.}$, he had, like Jonah (Jon 1^{3}), been at Joppa? Still more uncertain is the proposed derivation of Thomas from *tuâmu*, twin, in the sense of the Gemini in the Zodiac; for when Jeremias says, "The explanation of the word as δίψυχος—to harmonize with Thomas's character—is pointless," it is not the only possible explanation of the name: in Hebrew also תְּאוֹם means the twin, and a disciple could very well bear that name, at all events as a sobriquet. Zimmern[9] is certainly right, therefore, in rejecting these attempted explanations, to which, besides, Jeremias is far from committing himself unreservedly. It appears to me, in fact, very doubtful whether even the

[1] *Origine*, iii. 302 ff.
[2] *Keilinschriften*, 630.
[3] *Verständnis*, 48 ff.
[4] *Offenbarung*, 447 ff.; *Religion*, 374.
[5] *Babylonisches*, 89.
[6] *Forschungen*, ii. 387.
[7] *Babylonisches*, 92.
[8] *Babel u. das N.T.* 18.
[9] *Keilinschriften*, 629.

number of the twelve disciples is connected with the angels of the Zodiac (a view which Dupuis [1] long ago maintained). When Zimmern and Jeremias [2] appeal to the saying of Jesus in Mt 19^{28}, Lk 22^{30} "*Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel*," that is fully accounted for (apart from the expectation that the righteous would judge the heathen, Wis 3^{8} 6^{22} 8^{14}) by the fact that there were twelve disciples and twelve tribes. If ultimately this agreement is not accidental, and if the twelve tribes of Gn 49 should be brought into connexion with the signs of the Zodiac,[3] that would still have no significance for the number of the twelve disciples; for certainly later ages were no longer conscious of the relation between the twelve tribes and the signs of the Zodiac.

And still less conscious were they—to add this further point—of the astronomical sense of seventy-two, or roundly of seventy, the number of the larger company of Jesus' disciples mentioned only in Lk $10^{1.\,17}$, and, as so precisely defined, most probably fictitious. It is true that the well-known story of the seventy or seventy-two translators of the Old Testament has the variant forms that there were only five translators, or that they sat by pairs in different cells; and this circumstance, as Winckler [4] has seen, might indicate that the seventy-two and the five were still felt to be component parts of the year of three hundred and sixty days, or that the thirty-six so-called *decani*, which, according to Diodorus (*Bibl. Hist.* ii. 30), the Babylonians still distinguished, were thought of; and, further, the presents which Ptolemy sends to the high priest, a large and costly table, two milk-pitchers, and thirty cups, might signify the heaven, sun and moon, and the thirty days of the month. But the view that the seventy or (as attested by many authorities) seventy-two disciples, or even the equally numerous nations of which a list is given in Gn 10, or the number of the descendants of

[1] *Origine*, iii. 47.

[2] *Babylonisches*, 87 f.

[3] Cp. Zimmern, "Der Jakobssegen u. der Tierkreis," *Zeitschr. f. Assyr.*, 1892, 161 ff.; Stucken, "Beiträge zur orient. Mythologie," *Mitteil. d. vorderasiat. Gesellschaft*, 1902, 4. 46 ff.

[4] *Forschungen*, ii. 101 f.; cp. also Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 634, and Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, 359.

Jacob, had the same origin is, I think, *pace* Zimmern,[1] Jeremias,[2] and Fiebig,[3] quite indemonstrable. Even if the two numbers had originally had that significance, it would certainly have been no longer perceived in Christian times, any more than the meaning of the four living creatures and the four and twenty elders: the writer of the Apocalypse makes use of these aggregates merely because tradition had put them at his disposal.

Still, as those two aggregates have been shown to be ultimately of Babylonian origin, the question might be raised whether this is not also true of the Lamb, which the Seer first beholds in 5[6] "in the midst of the throne and the four living creatures and in the midst of the elders." Gunkel,[4] who holds such a view, argues that the eyes of the Lamb, as we have seen, primarily denote the seven planets; but that proves nothing for the origin of the figure as a whole, and the same must be said of the seven horns, to which Bousset[5] and O. Pfleiderer[6] refer. Further, the passage in Test. Jos 19: "*I saw that from Judah was born a virgin wearing a linen garment, and from her was born a lamb without spot, and on his left hand there was as it were a lion*," etc.—does not guide us to an earlier tradition, but is probably derived from the Apocalypse or, at any rate, from Christian phraseology. Conversely, the term ἀρνίον in our passage cannot be shown to have been interpolated: one is only astonished after the description in chap. 4 that here one suddenly reads of a presence which the Seer has not before observed, and which the author therefore seems not to have taken from the same tradition. Yet it might ultimately have a similar origin; but

[1] *Keilinschriften*, 634. [2] *Babylonisches*, 93.

[3] *Babel*, 18 f. But compare also König, "*Altorientalische Weltanschauung*" *u. A.T.*, 1904, 22 f.: "At all events on these assumptions the 'variant or round number' in question (viz. seventy) would be infinitely more common in the different literatures than seventy-two, which is supposed to be its genuine form; and, further, seventy may very well have arisen independently from a combination of seven and ten; for in the O.T., and also in the Amarna correspondence, ten meets us very frequently as *numerus rotundus*."

[4] *Schöpfung*, 299, n. 1; more cautiously, *Verständnis*, 62, n. 1.

[5] *Offenbarung*, 259.

[6] *Urchristentum*, ii. 298 [Eng. trans. iii. 423 f.].

can we really follow Dupuis,[1] Richter,[2] O. Pfleiderer,[3] Jeremias,[4] and Fiebig[5] in identifying ἀρνίον with Aries in the Zodiac, in which the sun now rises at the beginning of spring? The first of these scholars asserted that the Persians had the name Lamb for Aries, and, in fact, the word used in *Bund.* 2. 2 (*Sacred Books*, v. 11) is Varak, *i.e.* Lamb; Fiebig believes that in the cosmological myths there is a preference shown for the diminutive, but this cannot be proved for certain. In addition, we know nothing of so marked a reverence for Aries —either among the Babylonians, who perhaps had no acquaintance at all with that sign,[6] or in any other religion from which it could have been subsequently borrowed. For the ram which, according to Firmicus Maternus (*De Err. Prof. Rel.* 27), was sacrificed in the worship of Attis, and to which Jeremias[7] still refers us, has too little resemblance. And O. Pfleiderer[8] and J. Weiss[9] are even less justified in drawing a parallel between the washing of robes in the blood of the Lamb (Rev 7^{14}) and the criobolia which will be mentioned later. Above all, there is no need for any such explanation, even for the feature in Rev 21^{23} that the Lamb will be the lamp of the heavenly Jerusalem. Although the word used is ἀρνίον and not ἀμνός, still it can quite well be traced to this figure, which is to be found elsewhere in the New Testament, and therefore certainly also in early Christian phraseology. No one doubts that the other names bestowed on Jesus in Rev 5^{5} —the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David—have this origin. Thus the seven horns also appear to come from another, at least a similar, tradition, with which we shall become acquainted on a later page; the seven eyes, along with other characteristics attributed to Jesus in the Apocalypse,

[1] *Origine*, iii. 59 ff. [2] *Christentum*, 209.

[3] *Urchristentum*, ii. 298 f. [Eng. trans. iii. 423 ff.]; *Christusbild*, 90, 105 [Eng. trans. 132 f., 155].

[4] *Das A.T.* 69 [Eng. trans. i. 76]; *Babylonisches*, 9, 16.

[5] *Babel*, 15: but he has not a precise idea of the nature of the ecliptic.

[6] Cp. Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 60 ff.; *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1902, 370.

[7] *Babylonisches*, 16, n. 4, 19, n. 3.

[8] *Urchristentum*, ii. 299 [Eng. trans. iii. 424]; *Christusbild*, 90 [Eng. trans. 132 f.]. His assertion that the ἀρνίον in Rev 13^{11} corresponds to the ram in Dn $8^{2f.}$, I wholly fail to understand.

[9] *Die Schriften*, 1907, ii. 3, 91.

are certainly transferred to Him from God, to whom they are assigned in Zec 4^{10}. And although these eyes originally signify the planets, still the Lamb is not a constellation, just as those other aggregates that have been spoken of were no longer in later times understood in an astronomical sense.

And yet the New Testament has elsewhere conceived the heavenly bodies as living beings. Thus in the saying recorded in Mk $13^{24f.}$ (and par.) "*In those days . . . the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall be falling from heaven, and the powers that are in the heavens shall be shaken,*" the word "powers" certainly means "heavenly bodies"; and as δυνάμεις elsewhere (1 Co 15^{24}, Ro 8^{38}, 1 P 3^{22}, Eph 1^{21}) undoubtedly denotes "angelic powers," one might think that even the Gospel passages conceive these heavenly bodies as animated.[1] So also, when in Ac 7^{42} we find the stars described as the "host of heaven," we must probably at the same time think of "heavenly host" in the sense of Lk 2^{13}. But particularly in two other passages (Gal $4^{3ff.}$ and Col $2^{8ff.}$), the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, under which the Christians were held in bondage as under guardians and stewards, which are called gods, which by nature are no gods, which are put on an equality with dominions, principalities, powers, and (as the passage at last directly states) with angels, must be understood in the same sense. The description of subjugation to them as the observance of days, months, festivals,[2] and years (*i.e.* probably the beginnings of years), points more definitely to sun and moon: in other words, the sun and moon are conceived as living beings. Whether Paul at the same time thinks of the "elements," the original meaning of στοιχεῖα, can hardly be ascertained: the expression is found, *e.g.* in the apologist Aristides (*Ap.* 3. 2 ff.), in this the more general sense as well as with the more specific meaning of φωστῆρες. Further, it cannot be decided whether Paul is only echoing the opinion

[1] I pass over as uncertain the passages Lk 10^{18} and Mt 26^{53}, which are cited by Jeremias, *Babylonisches*, 85 f.

[2] Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 288, n. 1, thinks of "seasons of the year"; but these were not marked by any celebration.

of heathenism[1] which was commonly held among the Jews (Wis 13[2ff.]; Philo, *De Vita Cont.*, ed. Mangey, ii. 492, *De Decal.*, ibid. 189 f.), and which perhaps was in some degree influenced by philosophic scepticism—or whether he has in view a particular cult like that of Men or Lunus.[2] At all events he regards Sun and Moon as animated, a view which is also clearly stated in 1 Co 15[40f.]. For when he there proves the possibility of the resurrection by the argument not only that all flesh is not the same flesh, but that besides terrestrial bodies there are celestial bodies, Sun, Moon, and Stars, he must have conceived of these not merely as heavenly bodies in the figurative sense in which we use the expression, but as really living beings. On the other hand, it is again doubtful whether Ro 8[39]: *οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος . . . δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν* is to be taken in this way. It is certain that *ὕψωμα* is primarily an astronomical term, as Reitzenstein,[3] Lietzmann,[4] and Stärk[5] show: it denotes the culmination of a star and its influence, its closest approximation, not, of course, to the North Pole (for the distance from *it* is always the same), but rather to the zenith, through which approximation it becomes "better." Lietzmann further identifies *βάθος* with the celestial space which lies beneath the horizon and out of which the stars ascend; but he appends this remark: "Whether Paul knew this precisely is very questionable; it is likely that he had only the general consciousness that he was speaking of astral influences." And since, apart from this passage, nothing seems to be known of an astrological sense of the word *βάθος* (or will Lietzmann infer some knowledge of it from the later employment of this idea in Gnosticism?), it is probably more natural to suppose, with Reitzenstein, that Paul used the expression merely as antithetical to *ὕψωμα*. The last-named scholar's reference to Vettius Valens, who (*Anthol.* vi. prooem., ed. Kroll, 241) speaks of *ὕψος τε καὶ βάθος* of the moon, would

[1] Cp. Geffcken, *Apologeten*, xxiii, 49 f.
[2] Cp. Clemen, *Paulus*, 1904, i. 30 f.
[3] *Poimandres*, 80, n. 3. [4] *Handbuch*, iii. 46.
[5] *Neutestamentl. Zeitgeschichte*, 1907, ii. 75, n. 1.

no doubt, encourage one to see in *βάθος* also an astrological term; but that is by no means certain. And there is equal uncertainty regarding the question which is here of primary importance for us, namely, whether these celestial phenomena are traced and attributed to living beings. The preceding expression *οὔτε δυνάμεις*, to which less exception must then be taken than hitherto,[1] might point to that conclusion, while the following *οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα* would remain intelligible, even if that were denied. At all events, Bousset[2] should not have compared with the *ὕψωμα* of Paul the theory of the Shemhamphorash, which states that in the second heaven there are twelve lords or "heights": this work is far too late to furnish relevant matter. An indubitable trace of the belief in the animate nature of the heavenly bodies can therefore be found only in the Book of Revelation, where in 9^{1} a star falls from heaven, and there is given *to him* at once the key of the pit of the abyss.

In Jewish thought also this conception is already present,[3] but the earlier strata of the Old Testament probably do not contain it. Zimmern[4] and Jeremias[5] find it, I admit, as early as in the ancient song in Jg 5, where in v.[20] the words occur, "*They fought from heaven, the stars in their courses fought against Sisera*"; but is not that merely a poetical description? Then the name of God יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, and therefore also the expression מַחֲנֵה אֱלֹהִים which occurs in Gn 32^{3} (an Elohistic passage), are explained as referring to the host of heaven; but it is more probable, as finally Stade[6] shows, that they refer to the warrior-hosts of Israel. Jos $5^{14f.}$ no doubt speaks of שַׂר־צְבָא יְהוָה; but in regard to the origin of the passage Holzinger[7] remarks: "Kuenen, in view of the שַׂר־צְבָא יְהוָה, considers the section as one of the later portions: he thinks that the expression צְבָא יְהוָה is late, Ps 103^{21}

[1] Cp. Clemen, *Die Einheitlichkeit der paul. Briefe*, 1894, 86 f.

[2] "Die Himmelsreise der Seele," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1901, 271, n. 4. Nor is anything said of angels of the depths and heights in the Apoc. of Baruch 54^{3}, to which Bousset appeals in *Religion*, 372.

[3] Cp. the short account in Bousset, *Religion*, 370 ff.

[4] *Keilinschriften*, 456.

[5] *Babylonisches*, 83 f.

[6] *Biblische Theologie des A.T.s*, i., 1905, 73 f.

[7] *Das Buch Josua*, 1901, 12.

148[2], cp. 1 K 22[19]; and that the conception of a prince of the heavenly host has not a parallel before Dn 10[12ff.]. . . . Vv.[13. 14b] come from the original source and are in that case from J; v.[14a], as is shown by the awkwardness of the answer of the heavenly visitant, is a 'secondary' alteration . . .; v.[15a] is a 'secondary' appropriation from Ex 3[5]—perhaps, if v.[15b] . . . originally goes with it, first embodied in the narrative by R." Even here, therefore, we have probably no ancient evidence for the idea in question.

If, however, it has emerged only at a later date,[1] it is ultimately to be derived from Babylonian religion—not from Greek philosophy,[2] which probably owes the conception to the same source. Zimmern[3] even regards it as possible that the שַׂר־צְבָא יְהוָה of Jos 5 is to be traced directly to the masculine Ishtar, in her rôle as the planet Venus and leader of the host of heavenly bodies, as well as goddess of battles; and he thinks it remarkable that this captain of the host of Jahweh appears with drawn sword before Joshua in the same way as Ishtar the goddess of battles in the vision of Assurbanipal (*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, ii. 251). But this, of course, is not proof positive.

On the other hand, one may perhaps infer from the expression used by Paul that this idea has come to him (at any rate partially) through the medium of Mazdeism. We have already seen that στοιχεῖα originally means the elements, but subsequently the *spirits* of them and of the heavenly bodies; and Bousset[4] explains this very plausibly as due to an influence of Parsism, which, according to Herodotus (i. 131), placed the Sun and Moon alongside of Earth, Fire, Water, and Wind.[5] "Also in Mithraism, which is an offshoot of the Persian religion, the worship of the elements, as Cumont has proved in detail, plays a central part."

If, as Reitzenstein[6] supposes, the phrases already cited from Paul regarding the former bondage of Christians under the στοιχεῖα imply the belief in influences of the heavenly bodies

[1] So also Schiaparelli, *Die Astronomie im A.T.*, 1904, 41 ff.
[2] Cp. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Vet. Fragm.* ii. 200 f.
[3] *Keilinschriften*, 439.
[4] *Hauptprobleme*, 223 ff.
[5] But on this cp. Tiele, *Geschichte*, ii. 363.
[6] *Poimandres*, 79 f.

upon them, we should be bound ultimately to trace this astrological conception also to Babylonia. But Bousset[1] is certainly right (even in opposition to Jeremias[2]) when he denies in general the presence of this idea in Jewish thought. Nor do those statements of Paul require to be explained as an accommodation to the Galatian range of ideas: they may in part be understood in a figurative sense. He has shown in chap. 3 that we are freed from the law, and he will now make clear to his readers that they need no longer observe it; for this reason he speaks of their former condition as a state of bondage under the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*. Certainly he knows also of *ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, 1 Co 2^6; of *ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, θρόνοι, κυριότητες*, 15^{24}, Ro 8^{38}, Col 1^{16} $2^{10.\ 15}$ —terms which must always be understood as meaning angelic powers; but he does not identify them with the heavenly bodies. And so far as he regards these as animated, he does not deduce from this the astrological consequence of fatalism.

If we search further in the New Testament for *στοιχεῖα* in the sense of angels of the elements—neglecting the adjuration of wind and sea in Mk 4^{39} (and par.), which may be otherwise explained, and Jn $5^{3f.}$, which is probably spurious —we find in Rev 7^1 the angels of the four winds, in 14^{18} an angel who has power over fire, and in 16^5 the angel of the waters: in all these cases there are similar conceptions in Jewish thought. On the other hand, Jesus speaks in Mt 18^{10} of angels of the little ones, and in Ac 12^{15} such an angel of Peter is presupposed—and here again there is a parallel in Jewish belief.[3] Finally, we hear in the Apocalypse $1^{20ff.}$ of angels of the Churches, for by these we are to understand not bishops, but angels in the ordinary sense; and in 12^7 there appears, as was already noticed (p. 93), but as we can only prove at a later point, Michael as the guardian angel of Israel. All this may be fully explained by the tendency mentioned above, and yet foreign influences may possibly have co-operated here as elsewhere. Zimmern,[4] Bousset,[5]

[1] *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1905, 705 f. [2] *Babylonisches*, 52.
[3] Cp. the short account in Bousset, *Religion*, 372 f.
[4] *Keilinschriften*, 454 f. [5] *Religion*, 373.

and Jeremias[1] represent these influences once more as coming from Babylonia, and, in fact, we find there the same conception of guardian divinities or good daemons of individual men. When, however, Delitzsch[2] avers that the whole of the belief in angels is Babylonian, that is a palpable exaggeration: we must not even say with Gunkel:[3] "Whether the conception of angels in general originates in Babylonia, is another question which may perhaps be raised at this point, but can hardly be answered." So far as the belief in angels is really of foreign origin, one may just as well—in fact, since in its last mentioned form the belief is fairly late in appearing, one may better—think of Persian influences, as do Stave,[4] Moffatt,[5] and again Bousset. The Fravashis, says the first of these, "seem, indeed, not to be found in the Gâthas, but still in all probability belonged to the primeval elements of Mazdeism.[6] . . . From the Fravardin Yast we may perceive what a significant part they play in the religion of Mazda-worship. Every living being, not only in the terrestrial but also in the celestial world, has his Fravashi: the Amesha Spentas and the other Yazatas are not without theirs, even Ahura Mazda does not lack his. Generally, however, one invokes the Fravashis of the pious and those of Zarathustra and his associates. But all that fear God, even those who do not belong to the Iranians, have their Fravashis: it is through their influence that Sun, Moon and Stars run their courses, fountains and rivers spring from the earth, the winds blow, and plants have growth." Greek ideas also may possibly have operated alongside of this: still, to judge from all the evidence before us, their influence has probably been much less.

Whether all these are good or bad angels, is a question which in the majority of cases we must not ask at all. But besides these un-moral spirits, there are also some that are definitely bad, as they appear particularly and so often in the

[1] *Babylonisches*, 112 f.

[2] *Babel u. Bibel*, i. 41, *Anmerkungen*, 69 [See *Babel and Bible*, 63, 120 f.]; *Mehr Licht*, 1907, 50.

[3] *Israel u. Babylonien*, 27.

[4] *Einfluss*, 208 f.

[5] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1902–3, i. 778 f.

[6] Cp. also Jackson in Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss*, ii. 643.

Synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. They are also to be found in Jewish thought,[1] but are hardly a prominent feature in the Old Testament.[2] So far, however, as they appear there, we have in some degree to do with daemons whose origin is to be traced to Babylon: from Babylon therefore one must, with Zimmern, ultimately derive other conceptions also that relate to this subject. No doubt when Gunkel[3] and Jeremias[4] rank among these the idea that man is the dwelling-place of the daemon (Mt 12^{44}), this figure of speech, and the similar one in 1 Co 3^{16}, 2 Co 6^{16}, Eph 2^{22}, probably do not require any such explanation. On the other hand, such an explanation *is* required for those passages in the New Testament and in Jewish writings in which the seduction of women by daemons is supposed or assumed.[5] This belief does not come merely from Gn 6, a section which itself in turn goes back to non-Jewish ideas: "it is still a perfectly naïve mode of thought, which sees nothing wicked in the behaviour of the sons of Elohim, and therefore visits their deeds with no penalties."[6] Since, however, the devil Asmodaeus, who in To 3^{8} persecutes Sarah, is probably identical with Aêshma Daêva,[7] it is likely that Parsism had some influence, here first of all, but elsewhere as well, as Zimmern,[8] following Stave,[9] supposes. Moffatt[10] traces to Parsism in particular the idea that the

[1] Cp. the short account in Bousset, *Religion*, 388 ff.

[2] Cp., finally, Stade, *Theologie*, i. 188 f.

[3] *Verständnis*, 30, n. 2. [4] *Babylonisches*, 100.

[5] Cp. the short account in Everling, *Die paul. Angelologie u. Dämonologie*, 1888, 32 ff., 51 ff.

[6] Stave, *Einfluss*, 238.

[7] Cp. especially Jackson in Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss*, ii. 658 f. But Fries says ("Was bedeutet der Fürst der Welt in Joh. 12^{31} 14^{30} 16^{11}?" *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1905, 168): "When in To 3^{8} we find the name of a daemon Asmodaeus, which is generally identified with the Persian Aêshma Daêva, it must be remarked in the first place that this name cannot by any means be confidently identified in its etymology with the Jewish name of a daemon אַשְׁמְדַי; and, in the second place, it was probably introduced from Parsism into Jewish literature by a mere accident, since it possibly belonged to one form of the (originally Babylonian) Legend of Aḥiḳar—the form, namely, which became known among the Jews through the Book of Tobit."

[8] *Keilinschriften*, 462. [9] *Einfluss*, 237.

[10] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1903–4, ii. 353.

wicked spirits dwell in the air (Eph 2^2 6^{12})—a conception by which he also explains the circumstance that the seventh angel in Rev 16^{17} pours out his bowl upon the air; and, in fact, we find it also in *Yt.* 13. 13 (*Sacred Books*, xxiii. 183). Finally, one would have to consider the Greek belief in daemons, which, as Wendland [1] shows, offers direct parallels to the ideas last mentioned.

On the other hand, the frequently recurring notion (Mt 12^{45}, Lk 8^2 11^{26}, Mk 16^9) that there are *seven* daemons, neither more nor fewer, is not necessarily to be explained in this way. Zimmern [2] in this connexion points to the seven who are frequently mentioned in Babylonian texts, and further to the Daêvas of Mazdeism, whose existence is already presupposed in the Gâthas.[3] But if in the New Testament one had to think of the one set or the other, in other words, if the existence of a complete group of daemons corresponding to them were there assumed, then the definite article would necessarily have been used, and the first passage could not have run thus: "*Then the unclean spirit taketh with himself seven other spirits more evil than himself*"—nor the second thus: "*Mary that was called Magdalene, from whom seven devils had gone out.*" We have already seen that the number seven is not at all necessarily borrowed from the planets; and though Reitzenstein [4] assumes without proof the existence of an idea that the majority of the planets had several daemons, while fixed stars like the Pleiades had seven of them, he does not succeed in explaining how this should really have had any influence in the matter.

Satan also, who appears under various names and with varying frequency throughout the New Testament, and before that in Jewish thought,[5] can be explained without invok-

[1] In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 124 f.

[2] *Keilinschriften*, 459, 462 f.; cp. also Jensen, *Gilgameschepos*, i. 72.

[3] Cp. Jackson in Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss*, ii. 650, 655.

[4] *Poimandres*, 75, n. 4. Further, when Curtiss, *Ursemitische Religion*, 1903, 265, n. 4, says: "These seven are the same as the jinns who are worshipped by Arabians and Syrians to-day," he probably intends to explain only the belief in daemons in general. [Curtiss's remark does not appear, I think, in the original English work (*Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*).—Tr.]

[5] Cp. the short account in Bousset, *Religion*, 383 ff.

ing foreign influences. For if these should have affected the narrative of the Fall in Gn 3, that circumstance might still be left out of account, since the serpent is primarily regarded as nothing more than a beast of the field. But if we disregard the so-called "popular book" of Job, Satan is really to be found first in Zec $3^{1ff.}$, and there as a public prosecutor in heaven. "The prophet of the post-exilic Church," says H. Duhm [1] justly, "cannot explain its pitiful circumstances to himself except by the supposition that an inexorable accuser stands between God and His people, to nullify God's grace and goodness by his demand for justice." He is therefore, properly speaking, not bad, but, as Stade [2] expresses it, "on the way to develop into a being that thwarts God: the fact that he accuses Joshua is apparently not in harmony with Jahweh's intentions, and he is therefore rebuked." Still more, he appears in Job $1^{6ff.}$, though as one of the sons of God, yet at the same time as man's enemy, who has no longer a choice of action: accordingly, unlike Job's friends, he is not called to account by Jahweh. Finally, in 1 Ch 21^{1} "where we have no longer, as in Job and Zechariah, to do with a poetic or plastic representation, but with mere prose," [3] where the word appears even without the article and is therefore a proper name, Satan is certainly God's adversary, as he is subsequently in Jewish and primitive Christian thought. And yet this whole development, as we have said, may be explained without any supposition of foreign influence, simply by the wish to have a personal sovereign for the kingdom of evil. Further, Babylonian religion, to which Zimmern [4] appeals, offers no real parallel to this belief in the devil; Cheyne's [5] attempted derivation of the name Belial, which is found also in 2 Co 6^{15}, from Belili, the goddess of the underworld, is declared by the former scholar himself to be extremely improbable; even the conception of daemonic accusers, male or female, is somewhat different, and so, too, is the myth (which we shall discuss later) of the defeat of a monster by the

[1] *Die bösen Geister*, 61.
[2] *Theologie*, i. 328.
[3] Stave, *Einfluss*, 252.
[4] *Keilinschriften*, 461, 463 f.
[5] Art. "Belial," *Encyclopaedia Bibl.* i., 1899, 526.

deity.[1] Accordingly, as early as the eighteenth century men have inclined—Voltaire[2] was perhaps the first—to think of Parsism, in which the same dualism really existed, and, as we have seen (p. 26), even in pre-Christian times.[3] Bousset,[4] it is true, draws the distinction that Judaism still remained monotheistic; but that is true also of Parsism, not only because (as he himself points out, and as we shall see more clearly on a later page) it looks for an extermination of evil in the future, but also because the evil spirit Angra Mainyu is originally opposed not by Ahura Mazda himself, but by his Spenta Mainyu or good spirit.[5] If, on the other hand, Söderblom[6] urges that Judaism is much more pessimistic than Parsism, Bousset shows that even this is not correct: as in Parsism the contest between Ormazd and Ahriman, though with varying result, continues during the whole history of the world, so for Judaism and Christianity the world as a whole remains God's creation, and the devil appears only in the Gospel of John as his real adversary. This very point might be explained as partially due to a later, though indirect, infiltration of Persian ideas: but even the earlier belief in the devil which is found in Jewish thought and Christianity has its analogue in Mazdeism, and may therefore have been collaterally derived from it. The fact that the words in Is 45[7f.] "*I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness*"—are directed against Persian dualism,[7] is, of course, no disproof of this theory: on the contrary, it perhaps shows that there was a real danger that that dualism *would* influence Jewish belief. And if in the Testaments of the Twelve

[1] It is from this source that Oesterley, *The Evolution of the Messianic Idea*, 1908, 175 ff., also derives the idea of Satan.

[2] "Essai sur les moeurs et l'esprit des nations," 1754 ff., *Oeuvres*, xx. 228. But long before Voltaire, Theodore of Mopsuestia (in Photius, *Bibl.* 81) calls Ahriman *σαταν̂ας*; cp., further, Cumont, *Textes*, i. 134.

[3] Cp. Jackson in Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss*, ii. 647 f.

[4] *Religion*, 586 f.

[5] Cp. especially Tiele, *Geschichte*, ii. 154 ff., 189, 282; also Jackson, *op. cit.* ii. 648.

[6] *Revue de l'hist. des rel.*, 1899, xl. 260 ff.

[7] Further, in *Ys.* 44. 5 (*Sacred Books*, xxxi. 114) there are also the words: "*This I ask Thee, O Ahura! tell me aright; who, as a skilful artisan, hath made the lights and the darkness?*"

Patriarchs and in the New Testament, particularly in John, the kingdom of the devil, as in Parsism, appears as darkness and the kingdom of God as light, we shall, with Bousset,[1] see in this a genuine proof of Persian influences on the Judaeo-Christian conception of the devil. Other arguments, which will show still more clearly our warrant for this conclusion, must be reserved for the next section.

Alongside of the angels, with whom alone our discussion has hitherto dealt, there is at least one intermediary being still to be named here that is to be found in all the chief writings of the New Testament, and before that in Jewish thought [2]—viz. the Spirit of God. Even on the first page of the Old Testament (Gn 1^2) he appears already as a divine hypostasis: "*the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.*" And since this passage leaves various after-effects, we must here inquire whether the idea there stated is possibly due in part to another religion. In point of fact, Chaos and the Spirit stand also in the forefront of the Phoenician cosmology, which is not in this, according to Baudissin,[3] dependent upon the Old Testament, but springs from the same source as it. Here again, however, it is more natural to think of a possible influence from Parsism, in which we have already and, in fact, from the very outset, found the doctrine of a good spirit. He plays a part also in the creation, and is therefore often, and last of all by Bousset,[4] connected with the Holy Spirit in Christianity. Tiele [5] and O. Pfleiderer,[6] on the other hand, prefer to think of Vohu Manô, the first of the Amesha Spentas, whom others again view rather as one of the archetypes of the Logos. Vohu Manô, however, bears no particular resemblance either to the Logos or to the Spirit of God in the sense in which Jewish and Christian thought employ the term; and it is therefore only in a very general way that the doctrine of the Spirit could have been so influenced, as perhaps also by the conception of the Spenta Mainyu. That

[1] *Religion*, 587. [2] Cp. the short account, *ibid.* 400 f.

[3] Art. "Sanchuniathon," *Prot. Realencykl.*[3] xvii., 1906, 470.

[4] *Religion*, 592. [5] *Geschichte*, ii. 142.

[6] *Christusbild*, 16 [Eng. trans. 25]. But this parallel is not again referred to on p. 105 [Eng. trans. 155], where a summary is given of the features that indicate borrowing.

doctrine *need* not, it is true, be derived even partially from foreign sources: but the doctrine of angels and daemons is certainly in some points, and most probably in others, to be traced to Babylonian and Persian ideas.

b. The Last Things.

(*a*) *The End of the World.*—The New Testament at large anticipates that the process of history will have a violent conclusion, which again will be preceded by certain signs. If we consider these in the order in which they appear wherever they are enumerated with any completeness, the foremost of them is a supreme intensification of evil and sin. For so we are told first of all in the eschatological discourse of Jesus (Mk $13^{7ff.}$ and par.): "*And when ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars, be not troubled: these things must needs come to pass; but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: there shall be earthquakes in divers places; there shall be famines.*" Then we read in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians—which for the present I regard as Pauline, and therefore give it this place—that before the end the falling away was first to come (2^3), and in 1 Co 7^{26} that a distress was imminent, under which the married would certainly suffer more sorely than the unmarried. These calamities are depicted with the greatest detail in the Book of Revelation, under the image, first, of the first four seals or the so-called apocalyptic horsemen, then of the first three trumpets, and, finally, of the first five bowls of the wrath of God ($6^{1ff.}$ $8^{7ff.}$ $16^{1ff.}$). Further, when in 11^6 it is stated of the two witnesses—a conception which we have still to examine—that "*these have the power to shut the heaven, that it rain not during the days of their prophecy: and they have power over the waters to turn them into blood, and to smite the earth with every plague, as often as they shall desire*"—we ought, I believe, more especially in view of similar descriptions in other apocalypses, to think of afflictions that are actually to precede the end.[1] The author of the Apocalypse expects them in the order in which he enumer-

[1] Cp. Bousset, *Antichrist*, 129 ff. [Eng. trans. 195 ff.].

ates them, and has therefore taken the greatest possible care that the earlier calamities should leave something over for the later.[1] But originally they are, broadly speaking, identical; they have been divided up only because different circles described them differently, and represented them under different images—probably also under that of the seven thunders (10[3f.]). It is not possible, however, to refer these traditions with any certainty to more comprehensive origins. Finally, the expectation of a great falling away, which we meet in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, was more widely disseminated, as is shown not merely by other and similar passages, which can be more profitably discussed on a later page, but also by the opening of the third chapter of 2 Timothy: "*But know this, that in the last days grievous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of self, lovers of money, boastful, haughty, railers,*" etc. Jude [17f.] probably refers to the same feature.

Very similar statements are to be found in Jewish writings, in their most complete form perhaps in the Book of Jubilees, from which I therefore here cite the chief passages: "*For calamity follows on calamity, and wound on wound, and tribulation on tribulation, and evil tidings on evil tidings, and illness on illness, and all evil judgments such as these, one with another, illness and overthrow, and snow and frost and ice, and fever and chills and torpor, and famine and death, and sword and captivity and all kinds of calamities and pains. . . . And in that generation the sons will convict their fathers and their elders of sin and unrighteousness, and the words of their mouth and the great wickednesses which they perpetrate and concerning their forsaking the covenant which the Lord made between them and Him. . . . For all have done evil, and every mouth speaks iniquity, and all their works are an uncleanness and an abomination, and all their ways are pollution, uncleanness, and destruction*" (23[13. 16f.]).

[1] This accounts for τὸ τέταρτον (6[8]) and τὸ τρίτον (8[7. 9ff.]), and probably also for τὸ ἔλαιον καὶ τὸν οἶνον μὴ ἀδικήσῃς (6[6]). Accordingly this last expression, *pace* Reinach ("La mévente des vins sous le haut-empire romain," *Rev. arch.*, 1901, 350 ff.), Harnack (*Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1902, 591 f.), Jülicher (*Einleitung*, 243), J. Weiss (*Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 114), Porter (*The Message of the Apocalyptic Writers*, 1905, 190), and Bousset (*Offenbarung*, 135, 268), is not to be explained as an allusion to contemporary history.

That this expectation may be found also in the Old Testament, has in recent times been asserted, chiefly by Gunkel[1] and Gressmann.[2] In so doing, they leave out of account Meinhold's view that Am $4^{6ff.}$ contains an announcement of future calamities: in view of what has been said, the expression וְגַם אֲנִי נָתַתִּי might, in fact, be understood in this sense.[3] This interpretation is, of course, not absolutely necessary; it is possible, with Marti,[4] to paraphrase the passage thus: There is every reason why this cultus should please you (as was stated in v.[5]); Jahweh has also manifested His good pleasure and contentment with all manner of—afflictions and calamities. But even so, Gunkel and Gressmann suppose that there is an eschatological theory implicit in the passage, for this reason in particular, that the several calamities are not fixed chronologically nor separately described. But could one really expect chronological arrangement in such a prophetic discourse, and have we not actually individual description, particularly in v.$^{7f.}$, even if something be rejected there as of later origin? Thus, *e.g.* Marti[5] reads: "*And I also have withholden the rain from you, and two or three cities staggered unto one city to drink water, and were not satisfied: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord.*" Even if, however, the refrain has been omitted after v.^{7a}, as Gunkel supposes, that would not necessarily make the description "a tedious and almost statistical enumeration." And if Gressmann supposes, on the other hand, that it is only because of some fixed theory that Amos has been able to infer the destruction of the kingdom from those calamities, however infrequent they might be and however close their succession, it must be remembered that the prophet does not at all *characterize* them as precursors of the final judgment, but announces the final judgment *after and because the calamities have been of no avail.* Indeed, in $7^{1ff.}$ he narrates certain visions (perhaps of an earlier date), and he describes the calamities there announced as having been repented of by Jahweh, but once more *not* as prelusive

[1] *Verständnis*, 54. [2] *Ursprung*, 168 ff.
[3] *Studien zur israel. Religionsgeschichte*, i. 1, 1903, 38.
[4] *Das Dodekapropheton*, 1904, 180. [5] *Ibid.* 182.

of the end: such a theory, therefore, cannot be proved for Amos.

Further, Is $9^{7ff.}$ and $5^{25ff.}$—the passages without doubt stood in this order originally (whatever one may say of $10^{1ff.}$), and refer, I think, to the future[1]—depict not signs of the coming judgment, but the judgment itself. "The stages of the process are these: losses of territory in consequence of the attacks of the Syrians and Philistines; thereafter an appalling decimation of the people in a fierce engagement; then a delirium, a kind of madness, seizes upon the Israelites, which manifests itself in anarchy and civil war . . . and in the background there rises the sinister figure of the Assyrian to prepare for the doomed nation an inevitable end."[2] For the question before us, therefore, the passage has absolutely no significance.

Gressmann further points out "how in Jeremiah and Ezekiel in very many cases three or four calamities are, though not chronologically arranged, still most closely connected with one another";[3] but this proves nothing for a corresponding eschatological theory. The same must be said of the passage which Gunkel cites as specially important, Ezk $14^{13ff.}$: "*When a land sinneth against me by committing a trespass, and I stretch out mine hand upon it, and break the staff of the bread thereof, and send famine upon it, and noisome beasts, and the sword, and pestilence, and cut off from it man and beast; though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness. Also when I send my four sore judgments upon Jerusalem, the sword, and the famine, and the noisome beasts, and the pestilence, to cut off from it man and beast, yet behold therein shall be left a remnant that shall be carried forth, both sons and daughters.*" However, I shall return to these passages soon: this is not the proper place to discuss them, or the threatenings of Lv 26, of which there is no need at present to speak more precisely.

Yet Gunkel and Gressmann suppose, finally, that even the tradition of the plagues of Egypt, Ex $7^{8ff.}$, has such an

[1] In regard to this, cp., finally, Meinhold, *Studien*, i. 1. 100 ff.
[2] Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1900, 101. [3] *Ursprung*, 171.

eschatological scheme as its basis. But the latter scholar, who alone expresses his views fully on the question, ought, for one thing, to have stated that the three sources of Exodus contain only certain plagues, and that they have understood them differently. Above all, however, one can in my opinion believe that they may very well have arisen *gradually* from the idea "that Jahweh delivered His people from the power of the Egyptians with a strong hand and a stretched out arm."[1] When Gressmann finally urges that the slaying of the firstborn far too much resembles the preceding plagues to have been regarded from the outset as a crowning catastrophe, one must remember that it is not at all so characterized, but only as the last plague, the one which *has* an effect. Even from this, therefore, it cannot be proved that these plagues were originally presages of the end, still less that the end was a world-catastrophe. Whether such a thing is elsewhere presupposed in the Old Testament is a question that can only be discussed later: of a supreme intensification of evil and sin preceding the end, the Old Testament does not yet know anything.

But even if this expectation were really earlier, it might quite well be explained by ideas native to Israel. Originally, no doubt, an interference on God's part was postulated *because* evil and sin had so increased that it seemed impossible for things to go further: latterly, on the other hand, an extreme aggravation of both was expected *in order that* the judgment might begin. Yet here again it would be possible that this development had been aided by similar ideas in other religions known to Judaism. Can the existence of such ideas really be proved?

Winckler,[2] Zimmern,[3] and Jeremias[4] have, for one thing, pointed to execratory formulae from Babylon, in which kings are threatened with misfortune if they do not rule their land aright. "*Such and such a king*," the formula may run, "*will suffer adversity, his heart will not be joyful, during his reign war*

[1] Bäntsch, *Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri*, 1903, 58; cp. E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, 1906, 25 ff.

[2] *Geschichte Israels*, i., 1895, 123 f.

[3] *Keilinschriften*, 392 f.

[4] *Babylonisches*, 97.

and fighting will never cease. Under such and such a sovereign one man will devour the other, the people will sell their children for money, the whole land will be thrown into confusion, husband will forsake wife and wife husband, the mother will close the door against her daughter." But that is clearly something very different. On the other hand, the passage from the Ira-myth, which Jastrow,[1] Zimmern,[2] and Jeremias compare: "*Sea-coast against sea-coast, Mesopotamia against Mesopotamia, Assyria against Assyria . . . country against country, house against house, man against man, brother is to show no mercy towards brother; they shall kill one another. After a time the Akkadian shall come, overthrow all, and conquer all of them*"—is probably too uncertain in its sense to be employed in elucidation of the Jewish belief.[3] Consequently, Gunkel and Gressmann refer only to two recensions of the Babylonian account of the Deluge, according to which it is probably preceded by other disasters: but since there is no mention of these in the Israelitish narratives of the Flood,[4] it must, I think, be regarded as doubtful whether the expectation of calamities before the end springs even partially from this source.

Böklen,[5] on the other hand, adduces Iranian parallels, without necessarily inferring dependence; and in the first instance the passage from Plutarch already mentioned (*De Is.* 47). But though we are there told: ἔπεισι δὲ χρόνος εἱμαρμένος, ἐν ᾧ τὸν Ἀρειμάνιον λοιμὸν ἐπάγοντα καὶ λιμὸν ὑπὸ τούτων ἀνάγκη φθαρῆναι παντάπασι καὶ ἀφανισθῆναι, Theopompus is only subsequently cited, and that for the dissimilar view, ἀνὰ μέρος τρισχίλια ἔτη τὸν μὲν κρατεῖν τὸν δὲ κρατεῖσθαι τῶν θεῶν, ἄλλα δὲ τρισχίλια μάχεσθαι καὶ πολεμεῖν καὶ ἀναλύειν τὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου τὸν ἕτερον· τέλος δ' ἀπολεῖσθαι τὸν Ἅιδην, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀνθρώπους εὐδαίμονας ἔσεσθαι μήτε τροφῆς δεο-

[1] *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, 1898, 531 ff.

[2] Cp. also *Keilinschriften*, 587.

[3] Cp. Gressmann, *Ursprung*, 266: "Unfortunately our understanding of this myth is so incomplete that for the present it is impossible to say with any precision how the details of this passage are to be explained."

[4] The alleged traces, which Jensen (*Gilgameschepos*) thinks he has discovered, will be discussed to some extent on a later page.

[5] *Verwandtschaft*, 87 ff.

μένους μήτε σκιὰν ποιοῦντας. In the fourth century before Christ, therefore, nothing seems to have been known of any special aggravation of sin and evil that would precede the end: it is only for the first century after Christ that there is evidence of this expectation. For the *Bahman Yast* (2. 30, 54, 3. 4; *Sacred Books*, v. 203, 211, 216), to which Böklen further refers, is not earlier but very much later; and the Apocalypse of Hystaspes, which according to Lactantius (*Inst.* vii. 18. 2 f.) depicted the *iniquitas saeculi huius extremi*, was in this respect perhaps indebted to Judaeo-Christian ideas. So, notwithstanding Böklen[1] and Bousset,[2] Söderblom[3] may be right in saying that the corresponding tendency of Persian apocalyptic has arisen only at a later time; for if the Gâthas evince "a deep feeling of the depravity of the world and a solemn, potent and vivid fear of the imminent day of judgment," that is something different, and is to be explained by their particular aim.[4] Unless, then, some details point back indubitably to an Iranian source, the dependence of Judaism upon Mazdeism in this matter must be described as problematical. We have already to some extent elucidated the passage in Rev $8^{10f.}$, according to which only the third part of the rivers is turned to wormwood: can we at this point explain it definitely as due to the expectation set forth in the *Dînkard* (ix. 15. 2; *Sacred Books*, xxxvii. 198)—which here certainly goes back to earlier sources—that the serpent Azi Dahâka would devour a third part of mankind? At all events there is no need to derive from Parsism the λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοί of which we read not only in the eschatological discourse (Lk 21^{11}), but also frequently elsewhere. The opposite view may perhaps be urged on the ground that there are analogies in the Antichrist legend to what we are told in Plutarch, viz. that the daemon will destroy or injure himself by the famine which he has brought upon men: but these analogies are too remote and late for that.[5] And still less can the passages

[1] Cp. also *Verwandtschaft*, 145, n. 2. [2] *Religion*, 550 f.
[3] *La vie future d'après le Mazdéisme*, 1901, 253 ff., 278, 303.
[4] Cp. also Jackson in Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss*, ii. 668 ff.
[5] In regard to this, cp. Bousset, *Antichrist*, 133 f. [Eng. trans. 202].

adduced by Seydel[1] from the Lotus claim consideration as the original.

Nevertheless, the *form* which was assumed by the Christian anticipation of a culminating increase of evil and sin, might possibly be derived at one point or another from foreign influences. In reference to the expression "the beginning of travail" (Mk 13^8, Mt 24^8), this view will be more profitably examined later: otherwise it is only the images of the Apocalypse that require specially to be explained. And among these, the book with the seven seals (5^1) is declared by Gunkel[2] to be a magic book: he therefore traces the whole conception to the heathen superstition which had then penetrated even into Judaism and Christianity. But though each part of the roll, as it becomes in turn accessible through the opening of the various seals, appears to have instantaneous fulfilment (*i.e.* if we are not to suppose merely that the time between the opening of the successive seals is occupied with new visions[3]), the book is primarily a testament. This has been demonstrated by Zahn,[4] who follows Huschke[5] and is supported by J. Weiss;[6] for when Bousset[7] urges that the seven seals are, on the contrary, selected by the writer of the Apocalypse in correspondence with the seven signs, this view, even if it were correct, would not exclude the testamentary explanation of the book: but our later discussion will show that Bousset's view is at least uncertain.

When Bousset[8] further traces the number of the seven plagues to the "widespread" conception—which, therefore, has probably penetrated into Christianity from without—that the history of the world runs its course in seven ages, he has not proved the existence of this idea[9] even in the Book of Enoch; for even if the mountains mentioned in

[1] *Evangelium*, 265 f. [2] *Verständnis*, 60 f.
[3] So J. Weiss, *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 111.
[4] *Einleitung im das N.T.* ii. (1899), [2]1900, 590 f., 600 [Eng. trans. iii. 394 f., 405 f.].
[5] *Das Buch mit den sieben Siegeln*, 1860.
[6] Cp. also his previous work, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 1904, 57 ff.
[7] *Offenbarung*, 255, n. 1. [8] *Ibid.* 263; cp. 418.
[9] *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1901, 243.

$5\,2^{2ff.}$, of iron, copper, silver, gold, soft metal (quicksilver) and lead are kingdoms,[1] there are only six of them: the mention of tin (alongside of some of these metals) in v.^{8}, "*And there will be no iron for war nor garment for a coat of mail. Bronze will be of no service, and tin will be of no service and will not be esteemed, and lead will not be desired*" —has nothing to do with the matter; further, the five mountains of metal spoken of in $6\,7^{4}$, among which, indeed, there is one of tin, cannot prove that there are properly seven of them. Mandaeism certainly supposes seven ages of the world:[2] but this conception may be one of its later ingredients. Moreover, in the passages cited by Gunkel[3] and Zimmern,[4] to whom Bousset still appeals for the theory of seven ages, only four or twelve are spoken of: that idea, therefore, can hardly be proved to be early. And even if the arguments held, we should be no nearer an explanation of the number of the seven calamities that precede the end, to say nothing of the number of the seven kings, Rev 17^{10}, with whom the heads of the beast—a feature borrowed from tradition—are only latterly identified.

As for the Apocalyptic horsemen (Rev $6^{2ff.}$), who severally appear after the opening of the first four seals, they remind us in the first instance of the four horsemen or chariots in Zec 1^{8} $6^{1f.\ 6f.}$, which also have red, black, white, and dappled horses. They are in Zec $6^{5.\ 8}$ described as the four winds of heaven which quiet the spirit of Jahweh (by executing judgment, not by bringing on prelusive calamities). That explains, perhaps, their various colours, that is to say, if the four corners of heaven were associated by the Babylonians with the four planet-gods, Mercury, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn, and if these again had those colours.[5]

[1] Cp. also Beer in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen*, ii. 265, note t.

[2] Cp. Kessler, *Prot. Realencykl.*^{3} xii. 171.

[3] *Genesis*, 233 f.; *Verständnis*, 53.

[4] *Keilinschriften*, 536, 541 f.

[5] Cp. Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 633; Marti, *Dodekaproph.* 402. But a different view is held by Gressmann, *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1907, 2257, and M. W. Müller, "Die apokalyptischen Reiter," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1907, 292: "It is not proved that the Babylonians definitely assigned four planets to the four quarters of the heaven; and white is not the special colour of Jupiter, but of Venus." These two writers explain the four horsemen as

In the Apocalypse, no doubt, the four horsemen are no longer winds, but daemonic powers, which on this occasion have been connected with the three plagues that elsewhere also are commonly placed side by side (Jer 14^{12} 21^{7} 24^{10} $29^{17f.}$ 42^{17} 44^{13} etc.). The red horse was naturally identified with the sword, the black with famine, and for the horse of death "mottled" is replaced by "pale," the colour of a corpse.[1] But the white horse was left over, and could therefore be described[2] only in the general terms of v.[2]: accordingly it must not be connected with the aggrandizement of the Parthian power,[3] or the propagation of the gospel.[4] For the rest, however, the image is probably derived from Babylonia, where certainly it appears to have had another sense. On the other hand, there is no evident reason for believing, with Gunkel,[5] that another tradition, pagan in its origin, viz. that of four periods of the last days, is at the same time presupposed. Even the description of the four horsemen which we read here, and the interpretation which Gunkel gives of them—the first a sun-god, the second a god of war, the third a god of corn "here transformed into an angel of dearth" (!)[6]—correspond with none of the accounts known to us of the periods with which the world either begins or ends. One must therefore not even say with Bousset[7] that that conception is here the ultimate basis, still less that it comes to light elsewhere in the Apocalypse. For even in the case of the trumpets it is not the first four, but, on the contrary, the last three (as Woes) that are combined;

related to phases of the sun; but there is this objection, that almost always only three of these are distinguished: and the four horsemen have virtually nothing in common with the seasons, of which Müller at the same time thinks. For still another view, see Kleinert, art. "Perser," in Riehm's *Handwörterbuch*[2], ii., 1894, 1187; Stave, *Einfluss*, 130.

[1] Cp. Bousset, *Offenbarung*, 264 f.

[2] Cp. Bousset, *ibid.* 265: "One should observe how here, when the Apocalyptic writer is apparently working without a model, his favourite expression, the Johannine νικᾶν, at once flows from his pen."

[3] Cp. Bousset, *ibid.* 265 f.; W. Bauer, *Handkommentar zum N.T.* iv. (1891), [3]1908, 444.

[4] So J. Weiss, *Offenbarung*, 59 ff., *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 113 f.

[5] *Verständnis*, 53.

[6] With regard to τὸ ἔλαιον κτλ., cp. p. 118, n. 1 above.

[7] *Offenbarung*, 263; cp. also W. Bauer, *Handkommentar*, iv. 445.

and a difference is made between the bowls of wrath only thus far, that the first four are more general, and the last three more specific, in their effects.

To proceed with details—in the angel of the abyss Abaddon-Apollyon, who is king over the daemonic locusts (9^{11}), Völter[1] discerns Ahriman, who also has his abode in hell: it is more natural, with Bousset[2] and others, to think at the same time of Apollo, "whose name is elsewhere derived from *ἀπολλύω*, and who has the locust as one of his symbols." The armies of the horsemen in v.[16ff.] are certainly "composite creatures, such as the religious fantasy of the East conceived."[3] The further circumstance that (in the first place) their horses vomit fire, smoke, and brimstone, and (in the second place) only the horsemen are arrayed in the corresponding colours, suggests that this conception was no longer in harmony with the ideas of the later period. The appearance of unclean spirits in the form of frogs (16^{13}) is explained by Moffatt[4] as due to the Persian detestation of those creatures; but this scholar probably misunderstands the relative passages in the *Vendîdâd*, 5. 36, 14. 5, 18. 73 (*Sacred Books*, iv. 59 f., 167, 203);[5] indeed, the frogs in the Apocalypse (which are, of course, daemonic) are perhaps merely taken from the Egyptian plagues, which have, in fact, had a distinct influence on the whole account of the bowls of wrath. Further, the name of Har-Magedon in Rev 16^{16} perhaps does not come from a foreign religion,[6] but is connected with Megiddo.

If we turn to the second group of such signs of the end, the final assault of the hostile powers, it is a warrantable conclusion that the "abomination of desolation" spoken of in the eschatological discourse of Jesus (Mk 13^{14}, Mt 24^{15}) has primarily such a reference. For although that phrase in Dn 9^{27} 11^{31} 12^{11} (where, however, the שקוץ (מ)שמם originally signifies, or at any rate reflects, the בעל שמם) denotes specifically the erection of an altar to Zeus, yet in Mark the use of

[1] *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, 1904, 31.
[2] *Offenbarung*, 301.
[3] Gunkel, *Verständnis*, 52.
[4] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1903–4, ii. 352.
[5] Plutarch, *De Is.* 46, whom Moffatt also cites, speaks only of the *μύες ἔνυδροι*.
[6] Cp. Bousset, *Offenbarung*, 399.

the masculine *ἑστηκότα*, in spite of the neuter preceding it, *βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως*, points to a person.[1] But here again it is the Apocalypse which presents this expectation in different forms. First in 11^{7} a beast is mentioned which will come up out of the abyss and make war with the two witnesses. Also the men from among the peoples and tribes and tongues and nations in v.[9] are probably associated with it: for they are just as hostile in their feelings towards the two witnesses. Then in 12^{3} there appears a great red dragon with seven heads and ten horns, which, indeed, is described as the old serpent, the Devil and Satan, in v.[9] and 20^{2}, but must be alluded to even here: for he exactly resembles the other beast ($13^{1ff.}$) that comes up out of the sea and is a combination of leopard, bear, and lion. This last was probably already referred to in 11^{7}, and clearly denotes the Roman Empire. Also the other beast that comes up out of the earth (13^{11}), the false prophet as it is called in 16^{13} 19^{20} 20^{10}—by which we must understand the representatives of Caesar-worship—is originally, I think, identical with it: as is also, finally, the scarlet-coloured beast in 17^{3} with seven heads and ten horns, upon which sits the woman, *i.e.* Rome. The Book of Revelation, therefore, sees in the Roman Empire the power that will show hostility towards the Christians before the end, but then will be destroyed; and it announces besides (20^{8}) another assault to be made by the nations in the four corners of the earth, by Gog and Magog.

This expectation also is to be found already in Jewish thought, not only in its general form (Sib. iii. 663 ff., Enoch 56, 90^{16}, Ass. Mos. $8^{1ff.}$, Apoc. Baruch 40^{1}, 2 Esdras 5^{6} $13^{33ff.}$), but also with those special characteristics with which we have now become acquainted. In the Psalms of Solomon, which anticipate the end because of the reduction of

[1] Cp. also Bousset, *ibid.* 328: "At all events the author of the Didache, whose description of the last days closely resembles Matthew's, and who must have had at his disposal, besides Matthew, a clearer and more detailed tradition, regarded the matter thus. For after a manifest allusion to Mt 24^{11-13} [cp. Did. 16^{4}: *αὐξανούσης γὰρ τῆς ἀνομίας μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους*, the previous mention (in v.[3]) of false prophets and teachers, and the phrase *ἡ ἀγάπη στραφήσεται εἰς μῖσος*] he continues in these words, which are obviously based on Mt 24^{15}: *καὶ τότε φανήσεται ὁ κοσμοπλάνος κτλ.*"

Jerusalem by Pompey, we read ($2^{28.\ 29}$): "*Delay not, O God, to recompense it upon their heads, to turn the pride of the dragon to dishonour*"; and in the Jerusalem Targum on Nu 11^{27} "*On the last day, Gog and Magog and their army will march against Jerusalem.*"

Indeed we find this double form of the expectation in question already present in the Old Testament. The beasts of the Apocalypse recall those of Dn 7 f.; and if the four beasts in Dn $7^{3ff.}$ and the two in $8^{3ff.}$ furnish a total (in each group) of seven heads or horns, the theory is thereby confirmed that behind all these there stands originally *one* monster —but where does *it* come from?

We must now compare the other passages from the Old Testament where such beasts are mentioned, with which God has contended or must contend.[1] It is true that in Am 9^{3} that is not yet explicitly stated: it is only presupposed that in the sea there lives a serpent, which Jahweh can command to bite.[2] Further, in Is 30^{7} the designation of Egypt as Rahab —the name elsewhere applied to that monster, as we shall see immediately—is declared by B. Duhm[3] and Marti[4] to be later than the rest of the passage, and the reading of the following letters as הַמְשֻׁבָּח, "reduced to silence," is now questioned even by Gunkel. But when in $51^{9f.}$ we have these words: "*Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord; awake, as in the days of old, the generations of ancient times. Art thou not it that cut Rahab in pieces, that pierced* [*or disgraced*] *the dragon? Art thou not it which dried up the sea, the waters of the great deep?*"—we must certainly, as H. Duhm in particular has shown, think of the defeat of the primeval monster of chaos. It is referred to also in Ps $74^{13ff.}$ $89^{11ff.}$, Job 9^{13} $26^{12f.}$; in short, there can be no doubt that such a myth was known in Israel.[5] And when we

[1] For the discussion which follows, cp. Gunkel, *Schöpfung*, 29 ff., *Genesis* (1901), [2]1902, 105 ff.; Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 507 f.; H. Duhm, *Die bösen Geister*, 36 ff.; Jeremias, *Das A.T.* 177 ff. [Eng. trans. i. 192 ff.], *Babylonisches*, 38; Lotz, *Das A.T. u. die Wissenschaft*, 1905, 183, *Die bibl. Urgeschichte*, 1907, 55 ff.; H. Schmidt, *Jona*, 1907, 87 ff.

[2] This holds also against E. Meyer, *Israeliten*, 212, n. 1.

[3] *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1892, 194. [4] *Jesaja*, 221.

[5] It is not possible, with König, "*Altorientalische Weltanschauung*" *u. altes*

read in the extremely late passage Is 27^{1} "*In that day the Lord with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish leviathan the swift serpent, and leviathan the crooked serpent; and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea,*" it means that the defeat of the one monster is now divided among several, and represented as probably repeating itself in the last days:[1] and from this springs, at any rate, that form of the Jewish and early Christian expectation in which the beast appears in the same way as many separate beasts. As for that beast upon which the woman sits, it is expressly said of it in Rev 17^{8} "*He was, and is not, and shall come up out of the abyss*"; for though commonly this is referred to the Roman Empire in general (which has been wounded unto death by having one head cut off, but has recovered), or more definitely to Nero, the expression "shall come up out of the abyss" suits neither the one nor the other; and that wounding is nowhere mentioned but in 13^{3}, while Domitian as the *alter Nero* does not appear till 17^{11}. That the beast is originally a water-monster follows particularly from 12^{15}, where it casts water as a river after the woman, *perhaps* also from 13^{1}, where it comes up out of the sea, and 17^{1}, where the woman sitting upon it dwells at the same time on the great waters. But how is the conception as a whole to be explained?

So far as general features are concerned, the expectation of a final assault by the hostile powers may easily (like the first group of signs preceding the end) be traced to ideas within Judaism, or, if it should be earlier than that, within Israel. But the particular form which it has received from a corresponding speculation in regard to the primal age, points undoubtedly to foreign influences, such influences as after the Exile—and previous to that, as we have seen, the expectation does not exist—may very well have affected Israel. Can their existence be proved also in detail?

Test. (1905) 39 ff., to regard these as passages put in the mouth of non-Israelites: still less, with Köberle, "Orientalische Mythologie u. biblische Religion," *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 1906, 845 f., 857 f., to deny the existence of any myth in the Old Testament.

[1] H. Schmidt, *Jona*, 88, n. 1, draws this conclusion from Is $28^{16ff.}$, but hardly with justification.

Gunkel,[1] Zimmern,[2] Jeremias,[3] and Stärk[4] think particularly of the description of Marduk's conflict with Tiâmat in the Babylonian Creation-Epic: the more so, as there also Marduk (as in Is 51^{9}) first arms himself for the combat, Tiâmat (as in Job 9^{13}) has helpers and (as in Dn $7^{8.\,11.\,25}$, Rev $13^{5f.}$) utters haughty words. But there is one difficulty to which Jensen has repeatedly drawn attention,[5] viz. the fact that Tiâmat is described as a woman and not as a beast. We have, however, numerous representations of the conflict of a Babylonian god with some creature, either a compound of eagle and lion, or some form of serpent—which may be taken to be the monster of chaos (Figs. 5 and 6). It is that same monster, too, that is probably represented by the mushrushshû, the raging or red-gleaming serpent, which, according to his own testimony, was set up by Agumkakrime in Êsagila, the temple of Marduk—beside the helpers of Tiâmat of whom we hear in the Creation-Epic. "How such a mushrushshû was pictured to the fancy, we learn, however, from the results of the excavations at Babylon, if we compare them with the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar. For in correspondence with the representations of wild bulls and the mushrushshû mentioned by Nebuchadnezzar, there were found in the Kasr, and, in fact, at the very point in the track of the wall indicated by Nebuchadnezzar, brick reliefs *in situ*, which depicted bulls with striding gait, and a fabulous creature which had the head of a serpent (with horns), the forefeet of a panther, the hind-feet of an eagle, its body covered with scales, and at the end of its tail a scorpion-sting" (Fig. 7).[6] Finally, in the Nineb-hymn the weapon of the god is compared first with the mushmahhu, the great serpent with seven heads, and then with the mushrushshû tâmtim; and if the latter was originally the monster of chaos, so probably also was the former. Accordingly we should have in Babylonia a parallel to the

[1] *Schöpfung*, 114 ff., 360 ff., *Genesis*, 111 ff., and in Hinneberg's *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, i. vii., 1906, 68: "Still Egyptian and other influences may have contributed as well."

[2] *Keilinschriften*, 510 ff.

[3] *Das A.T.* 177 ff. [Eng. trans. i. 193 ff.], *Babylonisches*, 38.

[4] *Zeitgeschichte*, i. 88.

[5] Finally in *Gilgameschepos*, i. 60 ff.

[6] Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 504.

most various features in the tradition as we find it in Daniel and in the Apocalypse, and we could dispense with the comparisons still drawn by Gunkel and Zimmern, particularly between the juxtaposition of the one beast and the other ($13^{1.11}$) and that of Tiâmat and Kingu. Also the interpretation (which Hommel[1] has accepted) of the ten horns of the beast (12^{3} 13^{1} 17^{3}) as derived from the ten early kings of Babylon is still very uncertain,[2] although the horns are similarly explained in $17^{12ff.}$; still more doubtful is Gunkel's view of the phrase "abomination of desolation" as a name for the monster of chaos. On the other hand, this whole derivation of the tradition from Babylon would become still more plausible if it had been partially, or, as Dupuis[3] supposed, entirely, read off the sky. And, in fact, the constellation of Taurus, in which the Babylonians seem to have localized Marduk, lies almost opposite *serpens*, *hydra*, *draco*, and *cetus*; indeed, it is expressly said of the serpent that is found in still another mythological text, that it has been portrayed by Bel in the sky.[4] If, therefore, the ancient Babylonians had already known the precession of the equinoxes, they might for this reason have expected a repetition of this conflict in the last days: but such an assumption cannot in my opinion be proved. The 36,000 years which Berosus is said (in Syncellus, *Chronogr.* 30 f.) to have made the equivalent of a cosmic month—he actually assigns 432,000 years to the ten kings before the Deluge—cannot correspond to the 26,400 which form the Platonic year: the number is reached in the same way as other specifications among the Persians, Indians, and Chinese. For the Babylonian origin of the entire tradition it is therefore only the resemblances above referred to that are important.[5]

Jeremias[6] and Cheyne[7] point also to the Egyptian myth

[1] *Theol. Lit.-Blatt*, 1902, 147.

[2] In regard to the expression *καὶ ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι*, cp. p. 161 below.

[3] *Origine*, iii. 256 f.

[4] On all this, cp. Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 501 ff., 542. The relation to Labbu need not be examined here: still cp. Jensen, *Gilgameschepos*, i. 58 ff.

[5] In regard to Dn 8^{10}, Rev 12^{4} 13^{6}, cp. p. 137 below.

[6] *Das A.T.* 145 [Eng. trans. i. 159], *Die Panbabylonisten, der alte Orient u. die ägyptische Religion*, 1907, 51 f.

[7] *Bible Problems*, 212,

of the conflict between Ra and Apophis, Bousset and others (at any rate for Rev 12) to that of Horus and Typhon; but it will be better to discuss this on a later page. The former of these has no special resemblance to the Biblical story; further, it might itself be traced to Babylonia.

And so too, finally, the Persian tradition of the serpent Azi Dahâka, to which attention is called by Zimmern[1] and Völter[2] along with the scholars already named. Here, however, we have at the same time the supposition of a second appearance of this hostile power (*Bund.* 29. 8 f., *Sacred Books*, v. 119), as well as its identification with kingdoms of the world: as early as *Yaṣt* 5. 29 (*Sacred Books*, xxiii. 60 f.) the last enemy is transferred to Bawri or Bawli, *i.e.* Babylon, and his name is then used as a designation of the Arabians.[3] We see, therefore, that a tradition, which probably arose in Babylonian religion, but which resembled the Biblical tradition still more than this did, existed in Mazdeism: indeed, we can prove its existence even later in close proximity to Judaism and early Christianity. And that is important; for though the myth of the *primeval* conflict is found earlier in Israel, and may very well be of Babylonian origin—the more so as Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar, in whose reigns the nation came into contact with the Babylonians, paid especial reverence to Marduk—yet its transference to the eschatological sphere is only to be found later.

Mandaeism not only recounts a conflict of Hibil-Zîvâ with the dragon, but expects the appearance of the dragon also in the last days. And the description there given resembles the Babylonian: it has "*the head of the lion, the body of the dragon, the wings of the eagle, the flanks of the tortoise, the hands and feet of the fiend*" (*Ginzâ*, r. 280).[4] The evil principle of the Manichaeans is similarly described: "*Its head was as the head of a lion, the trunk of its body as that of a dragon, its wings as the wings of a bird, its tail as the tail of a great fish, and its four feet as the feet of creeping things.*"[5]

[1] *Keilinschriften*, 508. [2] *Offenbarung*, 118.
[3] Cp. also Söderblom, *La vie future*, 258 f.
[4] Cp. Brandt, *Die mand. Religion*, 1889, 43, 160, 182, *Mand. Schriften*, 226.
[5] Fihrist in Flügel's *Mani*, 1862, 86; Kessler, *Mani*, i., 1889, 387 f.

It cannot be doubted that these conceptions spring from Babylon, and were therefore present in Western Asia at the time when Judaism and Christianity arose, so that it was possible for them to influence the form in which the idea should present itself of a final attack by the hostile powers.

Again, the woman that sits upon the beast might be traced to a heathen idol. "It frequently happens," says Gunkel,[1] "in the history of religion that early religion represented the gods as animals, but that a later period preferred the higher, the anthroponorphic, portrayal, and placed the animal which had been bequeathed by tradition in some relation or other to the human figure of the god: the deity then holds the animal in his hand, or has it on his head; he wears some symbol taken from the animal's body, or stands or sits upon it. One should observe that the goddess in the tradition of Rev 17 has the same colour as the beast upon which she sits." While this is so, it may still be true, as J. Weiss[2] suggests, that there was also the idea of a bacchante riding on a panther or some other wild beast.

Finally, Gunkel[3] supposes that in 1 P 5^8 also, the description of the devil as a lion is probably "a relic of mythological representation";[4] but that rather misses the point. It is *because he walketh about* that he is compared to a *roaring* lion. Also the expression in 2 Ti 4^{17} "*I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion*" is probably proverbial.

If we turn now to the other figure in which the expectation of a final assault by the hostile powers meets us in Jewish and Christian thought, it, too, is to be found in the Old Testament. In the two well-known chapters of Ezekiel (38 and 39), the genuineness and unity of which need not be examined at this point, an invasion by Gog of Magog (for that is the relation of these two names here) is looked for. But while this prediction has hitherto been regarded as "primarily a mere product of reflection,"[5] based upon the Scythian invasion

[1] *Schöpfung*, 365. [2] *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 146. [3] *Ibid.* 59.

[4] Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligion u. das Problem des ersten Petrusbriefes*, 1911, 103, thinks of the lions of Cybele: but if such a connexion had been thought of, it would have been more clearly brought out.

[5] Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttest. Religionsgeschichte* (1893), ^{2}1899, 294.

in the time of Josiah and perhaps upon the march of Nebuchadnezzar's army, Gressmann,[1] with the approval of Bousset,[2] would maintain that here too a mythological tradition has been at work. In proof of this, he refers to the expression used in 38^{12}, that Gog would march against a people that dwell on the navel of the earth; and he remarks on this: "Such an idea may perhaps have been formed in the great monarchies of antiquity, but as indigenous in the petty kingdom of Israel it is simply incomprehensible." But is it not true, as Gressmann himself observes, that a certain place is mentioned as a navel of the land or of the earth in Jg 9^{37}, that is to say, in the older stratum of the heroic stories drawn from the earlier regal period and elaborated in that book? One must not therefore infer from that a foreign,[3] still less a mythological, origin of the tradition: for even if in Ezk $38^{19f.}$ we are told: "*In that day there shall be a great shaking in the land of Israel; so that the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the heaven, and the beasts of the field, and all creeping things that creep upon the earth, and all the men that are upon the face of the earth, shall shake at my presence, and the mountains shall be thrown down, and the steep places shall fall, and every wall shall fall to the ground,*" that does not mean—one has only to compare the similar descriptions in the Apocalypse—that Israel also must perish, that by Gog, therefore, one has originally to understand an enemy of God. And still less does that follow from the second reason which Gressmann urges, namely, that Gog, according to 39^{11}, is to be buried east of the (Dead) sea; for this is explained in v.[12] by the circumstance that the land would be polluted by the corpses. If the place of burial, however, is previously described as within Israel, that is slightly inaccurate: even from the directions given in v.[14ff.] it may be inferred that the place is to lie outside the land. There is nothing, then, that points to a "mythical valley of the dead"; Gog is, as Gressmann himself says, "a real, historical people, regarding which, it is true, all

[1] *Ursprung*, 180 ff. [2] *Religion*, 251.

[3] The detailed exposition in Jeremias, *Das A.T.* 48 ff. [Eng. trans. i. 53 ff.] is known to me, but not convincing.

manner of legends were current, but in whose dwelling-place at the extremity of the world there was still a firm belief." Thus it could be declared of Gog in 38^4, in language suggested by the conflict with the dragon, "*I will put hooks into thy jaws*"; but the conception itself is for that very reason not mythological.

Even the other passages which Gressmann adduces in support of this contention have no conclusive force. Zec $14^{1ff.}$ may be entirely disregarded—for any important meaning that it might bear has first to be conjectured and read into it. And when in Jl 2^{20} we read: "*I will remove far off from you the Northerner, and will drive him into a land barren and desolate, his van into the eastern sea, and his rear-guard into the western sea,*" this expression can be satisfactorily explained[1] by Zeph 2^{13}, Jer 1^{14}, Ezk $29^{4ff.}$ $32^{3ff.}$ $38^{6.\ 15}$. The question whether there is still another tradition lurking behind Dn $11^{40ff.}$ need not be examined here, since there is no parallel to that passage in the New Testament: the passages in the older prophets, however, which announce an invasion by many or by all peoples, and which cannot be altogether explained as later (Is $8^{9f.}$ $11^{12ff.}$, Jer 1^{15} etc.), can be understood even without presupposing a definite expectation of that sort. "When one is himself excited, one believes that others must be excited too: Joshua bids the heavenly bodies look on (Jos 10), Deborah bids the kings listen (Jg 5^3), Isaiah (1^2) calls upon the heavens and the earth to give ear."[2] Even from this side of the question, therefore, we need not trace the expectation to foreign influences.

But we must return to the identification made in the Apocalypse between the dragon and the devil, with which

[1] Cp. Stocks, "Der 'Nördliche' und die Komposition des Buches Joel," *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 1908, 733 ff. Wellhausen, *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, v., 1892, 209, points out that among the Moslems Sufjani has been transformed from a historical to an apocalyptic idea, which could be filled with varying content. In all this I assume the correctness of the translation given above, but I should like to quote one sentence further from Gruppe, *Mythologie*, 409: "In Phoenicia, where צפון (darkness) and צפעוני (viper) have a similar sound, [the serpent] became a favourite symbolical expression for the darkness in the depths of the earth, . . . and in this sense Set was also in Phoenician translated by צפון.

[2] B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 60.

again may be compared the connexion established in 2 Th 2^9 between the devil and "the lawless one." Such an appearance of Beliar himself is announced also by the Sibylline Oracles (iii. 63), and the idea is probably derived from Parsism. In *Bund.* 30. 30 (*Sacred Books*, v. 128) there is an expectation of an attack by the evil spirit in addition to the attack by the serpent: besides all this, however, such an assault—here again one may note the parallelism between the primal and the closing age—has taken place in earlier times, according to 3. 10 ff. (*ibid.* 17). And when it is there stated: "*Afterwards, the evil spirit, with the confederate demons, went towards the luminaries, and he saw the sky; and he led them up, fraught with malicious intentions. He stood upon one third of the inside of the sky, and he sprang, like a snake, out of the sky down to the earth. In the month Fravardîn and the day Aûharmazd he rushed in at noon, and thereby the sky was as shattered and frightened by him as a sheep by a wolf*"—one may certainly, as Böklen[1] does, compare Rev 12^4 "*And his* [*the dragon's*] *tail draweth the third part of the stars of heaven and did cast them to the earth,*" and Dn 8^{10} "*And some of the host of heaven and of the stars it* [*the little horn*] *cast down to the ground, and trampled upon them.*" Not as if one could therefore, with Bousset, describe the Antichrist legend as a "precipitate of Iranian eschatology"; Antichrist is still something different from "the devil anthropomorphized": but Parsism, it must be admitted, has influenced one form of the expectation of a final assault by the hostile powers, the form, namely, which is commonly described as the doctrine of Antichrist.

There remains for our discussion still a third group of signs preceding the end, the group which consists of natural phenomena. "*But in those days, after that tribulation,*" such are the words in the eschatological discourse of Jesus (Mk $13^{24f.}$ and par.), "*the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall be falling from heaven, and the powers that are in the heavens shall be shaken.*" And similarly in the Apocalypse ($6^{12f.}$): "*And I saw when the Lamb opened the sixth seal, and there was a great earthquake;*

[1] *Verwandtschaft*, 126.

and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the whole moon became as blood; and the stars of the heaven fell unto the earth, as a fig tree casteth her unripe figs, when she is shaken of a great wind" (cp. also 8^{10} 9^{1}). This expectation is found already in Jewish thought (Sib. iii. 801 f., Enoch $80^{4ff.}$ 102^{2}, 2 Es $5^{4f.}$); but in certain passages, particularly in Ass. Mos $10^{4ff.}$, it is rather the appearance of God Himself that is so described. And so it is in the Old Testament: so far, however, as the Judaeo-Christian conception of natural phenomena preceding the end has arisen from this idea, combined with the belief in such indications generally, we must study it closely to discover its possible origin in other religions.

It is again Gunkel[1] and Gressmann[2] who assert such an origin, while Bousset[3] expresses himself with some reserve. And, in fact, the first two writers have only proved that Jahweh was originally a volcano-god, and therefore even in later times manifests Himself in smoke and fire, amid lightning and thunder, earthquake and darkness. But the supposition that even the earliest prophets assumed a cosmological or universalistic eschatology, seems to me to rest on a misunderstanding of the prophetic mode of speech, which has been briefly characterized above (p. 136). Further, it is nowhere indicated that that eschatology was the popular one, as Gressmann always maintains: what Amos attacks (5^{18}) is the conception that the day of Jahweh is light and will bring Israel prosperity: but how this conception should have arisen from that (assumed) eschatology, one cannot discover. And if the prophets had in later times revived such an eschatology, they would in some way have referred back to it: but that, again, is nowhere the case. Finally, another argument, which by itself, I admit, is not conclusive, may be urged against the hypothesis in question: an eschatology like this could not have been produced by Israel unaided, but we have no means of proving that such doctrine existed among any

[1] *Verständnis*, 21 ff., and in Hinneberg's *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, i. vii. 68. His words: "This whole question is clamant for discussion," have obviously been the occasion for Gressmann's book.

[2] *Ursprung*, 14 ff.

[3] *Religion*, 277, n. 1.

people that influenced Israel quite so early. Gunkel refers particularly to Is 37^{26}, where the Assyrian is asked: "*Hast thou not heard how I have done it long ago, and formed it of ancient times?*"—but on this we must observe with B. Duhm:[1] "The Isaiah of the writer proceeds on the involuntary assumption that the Assyrian is at home in Old Testament theology and has read Is 22^{11}." That belief, however, in premonitory signs in general which *in later times* regarded the various manifestations of Jahweh as signs of the coming end, is, I admit, of Babylonian origin:[2] but the case is not thereby proved for the particular expectation which we are here discussing.

Further, when Böklen[3] remarks: "According to *Bahman Yaṣt* 2. 31 (*Sacred Books*, v. 203) the sun becomes less and less visible, is covered with spots, the years, months, and days are shortened; also, according to 3. 4 (*ibid.* 216) the impending arrival of the enemies with the red weapons is indicated by changes in the sun and moon"—these passages are too late to be rashly brought into the argument. On the other hand, *Yaṣt* 13. 58 (not 57) [*ibid.* xxiii. 194] says only that sun, moon, and stars will move in their courses "*till they come to the time of the good restoration of the world*," just as, in Enoch 72, Uriel shows to the seer "*how it is with regard to all the years of the world and unto eternity till the new creation is accomplished which dureth till eternity*"—thus the passage is not relevant to our present subject. The circumstance, however, that in Rev 8^{10} a star falls from heaven and the third part of the water becomes wormwood, might be traced to what is said in *Bund.* 30. 18 (*ibid.* v. 125) regarding the fall of the star Gôkîhar and the distress which the earth in consequence must endure. But that would be only one particular which admitted of such an explanation: apart from it, a derivation of this conception in its details from other religions is not even necessary.

Among the signs of the end we may name, finally, the appearance of forerunners of the Messiah, such an appearance as is expected first of all in the Gospels. Jesus assents to the

[1] *Jesaja*, 248.
[2] Cp. Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 393.
[3] *Verwandtschaft*, 90.

view of the scribes, that Elias must first come, and He sees him in John the Baptist (Mk $9^{11ff.}$, Mt $17^{10ff.}$ 11^{14}). This, however, did not necessarily prevent His disciples from expecting the appearance of Elias and Moses only in the future, at the Parousia of Jesus, or from having a prior vision of them at the Transfiguration (Mk $9^{2ff.}$ and par.). In the Book of Revelation ($11^{3ff.}$) both Elias and Moses—for in view of the description in v.[6] the two witnesses are to be identified with them—are again regarded as forerunners of the Messiah, who are to be killed by the beast, to lie unburied in Jerusalem for three days and a half, and then to go up into heaven. With reference to Elias this expectation is found already in Jewish thought (Sir $48^{10f.}$), and in the Old Testament (Mal $3^{23f.}$); for if here it is no appearance of the Messiah, but the day of Jahweh, that is expected, that makes no difference. It is easy also to understand how that idea arose—or rather, it is explained by the prophet Esdras himself, when he says in general terms (2 Es 6^{26}): "*And they shall see the men that have been taken up, who have not tasted death from their birth.*" Accordingly one need not, with Bousset,[1] connect the returning Elias with the Persian Messiah, the less on this account that the two have hardly any affinity with one another. But the fact that, while elsewhere still other precursors were expected,[2] in the Apocalypse only those very two appear, must probably be due to a special reason. Now the Apocalypse itself states in 11^{4}: "*These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks standing before the Lord of the earth*"—just as in Zec $4^{2ff.}$ we hear of a seven-branched candlestick and two olive trees on its right and left, which are then explained as the two anointed ones, *i.e.* Joshua and Zerubbabel. It is possible that two precursors of the Messiah, neither more nor fewer, were spoken of for this reason, that in the tradition, as it appears in the Apocalypse, there were two heavenly candle-

[1] *Religion*, 584, n. 2.

[2] Cp. the short account in Volz, *Jüd. Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, 1903, 193 f.; and Bousset, *Religion*, 267, 300 f. But Volz and Bousset confuse these precursors of the Messiah with His companions: they ought in the first instance to be distinguished.

sticks (perhaps originally the sun and moon), and two olive trees (to supply them with oil). But this explanation is not, I think, particularly natural: it might, therefore, be conjectured that the number two had another origin.

Gunkel has accordingly thought of the Babylonian account of "Anu and Nudimmut's ineffectual advance against Tiâmat, till Marduk appeared and overcame her."[1] In proof of this he cites Rev 11^7 "*the beast shall make war with them*," an expression which, he says, indicates that originally they were divine warriors, celestial heroes;[2] but the expression is found also in 12^{17}, where it refers to the Christian Church. And, at all events, there is nothing further in the two witnesses to remind one of the Babylonian gods.

Böklen,[3] Bousset,[4] and Moffatt[5] therefore compare the Persian expectation, that along with the Messiah there would reappear pious men of antiquity, and that two forerunners would precede him (*Bund.* 30. 17, 32. 8, *Sacred Books*, v. 125, 144). The former of these ideas has probably, in fact, influenced Jewish thought in later times: for in the Derekh Erez there are included among those companions of the Messiah not only converted Gentiles, men and women, but also the kith and kin of the bird Murg, which belongs to the Iranian legend. But that is no evidence for a preceding age, although the expectation probably belongs to early Parsism: and, above all, the passage deals with companions, not forerunners, of the Messiah. For if these in Jewish and Christian belief are pious men of antiquity who had not died a natural death, it needed no foreign prototype to suggest that they would return before the end. As for the other point, the precursors of the Messiah in Parsism are to appear one thousand and two thousand years before him: they are therefore precursors in an entirely different sense from Moses and Elias in Jewish and Christian belief. The one point of resemblance is that there are two of them in the Judaeo-Christian as well as in the Persian tradition: but is one bound for that reason to suppose that there is a dependence upon Parsism?

[1] *Verständnis*, 60.
[2] So also Bousset, *Offenbarung*, 321.
[3] *Verwandtschaft*, 100 ff.
[4] *Offenb.* 318; *Religion*, 267.
[5] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1903–4, ii. 349 f.

Still, this explanation is more plausible than the one recently offered by Bousset.[1] He compares the notice contained in Sharistâni's account, that after Ormazd and Ahriman had concluded their negotiations for the division of the sovereignty, they had taken two just men as witnesses, to whom they had handed over their swords and said, "If one of us infringes the agreement, you must kill him with this sword." But this account is much too late—Sharistâni died in 1153 A.D.; and even if it were earlier, the tradition in the Apocalypse could hardly be connected with it.

There is, however, one isolated feature in the picture of these two witnesses that is ultimately to be traced to a foreign provenance. After preaching for a thousand two hundred and threescore days (or three years and a half), they are to rise from the dead after three days and a half (Rev $11^{3.\ 9.\ 11}$): this is probably not by analogy with the resurrection of Jesus on the third day or after three days, but goes back to another tradition. Now in 11^{2} 13^{5}, Dn 7^{25} $12^{7.\ 11f.}$ the wicked one is said to have power for a period that is measured as three and a half, and this number is in all probability traditional in these passages. *If* the myth of the beast of the last days had as its basis the succession of summer and winter, one might, with Gunkel,[2] explain this number by the three and a half months which are the approximate length of the latter season: but, for one thing, there is no proof that the length of the winter was so reckoned,[3] nor is that interpretation of the myth as a whole clearly established.

The end itself, according to the New Testament, is brought about by the intervention of God or the Messiah;

[1] *Hauptprobleme*, 141, n. 1. [2] *Verständnis*, 80 ff.

[3] Zimmern, to whom Gunkel appeals, says in *Keilinschriften*, 389, only the following: "Again in Babylonia another length for the 'evil time,' which originally perhaps (!) denoted the time from the winter solstice to the vernal equinox, seems (!) to have been the period three months, ten and a half days. For this see *Maklû*, v. 51: 'Who art thou, Sorceress, whose doings [last] for three months, ten days, half a day?'" The theory of Carus ("The Number π in Christian Prophecy," *Monist*, 1906, 415 ff.), which is sufficiently indicated in the title of his article, is probably in no need of formal disproof.

but this expectation, in the form in which it existed there and in Jewish thought before it, does not require any further analysis or proof. Also in the Old Testament we may leave unexamined the genuineness of the passages relevant to the question: the point we have to consider is whether perhaps the Messianic idea is of foreign origin.

Gressmann,[1] following Gunkel,[2] maintains that it is, and takes as his starting-point Is 7[14ff.], where again he finds the birth of the Messiah predicted. The decisive feature for him is apparently v.[15] "*Sour milk and honey shall he eat*"—or rather the supposition that by these we have to understand the food of the gods. But this interpretation cannot be proved for the Old Testament, where milk and honey always appear only as the symbol of the fertility of a land. Indeed, in Is 7 there is no mention at all of חֶלֶב וּדְבַשׁ, as always elsewhere, but of חֶמְאָה וּדְבַשׁ:[3] and this is not only explained as shepherd's fare in v.[22], but can be taken in that way also in v.[15], viz. sour milk and honey shall Immanuel eat till he knows to refuse the evil and choose the good; for before that comes to pass, Aram and Ephraim will be left desolate, but Judah, in which the enemy is already established, will be freed from him, so that cattle-breeding, at any rate, may again go on. There is no need, therefore, to explain v.[15] as a later addition: on the contrary, if that is done, the כִּי at the beginning of v.[16] loses all its force. For if the name Immanuel is to be a *sign*, the circumstance that Aram and Samaria will be left desolate, cannot furnish the *reason* for that name, unless one supposes, as B. Duhm,[4] Marti,[5] and Meinhold[6] on various grounds decide, that the name was to remind Ahaz *in later times* of this meeting with Isaiah, and of his unbelief; but there is nothing which in the first instance points decisively to that. It is only from v.[17] onwards that the *judgment* on Judah is spoken of, and that cannot, of course, have belonged to this context originally: on the other hand, in v.[14ff.], as in 8[1ff.], the *deliver-*

[1] *Ursprung*, 272 ff. [2] *Verständnis*, 24 f.

[3] The fact that there is a word of like origin which is used (Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 526, n. 4) of sour milk as an "element" in the Assyrian cultus, has no decisive force against my argument.

[4] *Jesaja*, 54. [5] *Jesaja*, 77 f. [6] *Studien*, i. 1, 113 ff.

ance of Judah is announced and guaranteed by a sign: "*the woman*"—Isaiah refers to a definite young woman who has not yet borne a child (for that is the meaning of עַלְמָה)—"*the woman will bear a son, whom one*"—I do not decide on the correct reading of קראת—"*will call Immanuel.*" If it is asked how Isaiah could know that it would be a son, the question implies a misunderstanding of the consciousness which the Old Testament prophets had of their vocation; even this expression, therefore, cannot be cited in support of the Messianic interpretation of the passage. And if Gressmann finally applies to it the words which Gunkel uses with reference to another passage to be discussed later: "a human being newly born cannot help his nation, a divine child can"—here there is absolutely no help expected from the child: there is still less reason, therefore, for identifying him with a mythological figure derived from another religion.

If we proceed now to Mic $5^{1ff.}$, it must, for one thing, be remarked that v.^{2} seems to be later. For then, even if one regards the rest of the passage as genuine, one may still, with many commentators, see in the יוֹלֵדָה an allusion to Is 7^{14} Messianically interpreted. Gressmann, however, infers from the expression the existence of a special tradition, since the seven shepherds and eight princes of v.^{4} "cannot be drawn from the alleged source in Isaiah." But is this verse, "*When the Assyrian shall come into our land, and when he shall tread in our palaces, then shall we raise against him seven shepherds, and eight princes of men,*" not capable of Marti's [1] interpretation, that the sacred number seven is outbidden by eight, or even that if the verses belong to this period, there is a reference to the Maccabees down to Judas and John?

Is $9^{1ff.}$, which even Oesterley quotes in support of the theory we are speaking of, is indeed more remarkable. The thought of the passage is fairly clear, if only the three כִּי at the beginning of vv.$^{3-5}$ are co-ordinated: "*Thou shalt give abundance of exultation, thou shalt bestow great joy, they will joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, as men rejoice when they divide the spoil;* FOR *the yoke of their burden and the staff upon their shoulder thou breakest as in the day of the*

[1] *Das Dodekapropheton*, 288 f.

slaughter of Midian; FOR *all the shoes of those that are shod in the tumult of war, and the garments rolled in blood, are burned as fuel of fire;* FOR *a child is born to us, a son is given to us.*" Further, that even from the *birth* the deliverance of Israel was expected, need no more be assumed here than in Mic $5^{1ff.}$: but the names given to this child might perhaps be of mythological origin. Not, however, the first, פֶּלֶא יוֹעֵץ—for that is certainly far from being the same thing as עֹשֶׂה פֶּלֶא, the name applied in 25^{1} to Jahweh—but perhaps אֵל גִּבּוֹר. Gressmann quotes B. Duhm: "How a mighty El is to be thought of, how far his power extends, is shown by the narrative regarding the El of Peniel (Gn $32^{25ff.}$), and his unsuccessful assault on Jacob, who also, of course, is of superhuman strength." But the preceding sentence may perhaps be quoted as well: "Isaiah here makes use of a popular and hyperbolical expression, which is quite innocent in earlier times (cp., further, 2 S $14^{17.\ 20}$), and has its analogies even in later times (Zec 12^{8})." Again, אֲבִי־עַד is, I think, more correctly translated "Father for ever" than "Father of booty"; but even in that case one need not, with Gressmann, recall the designation of God in 57^{15} as שֹׁכֵן עַד, but may, with Marti, think of גְּבֶרֶת עַד in 47^{7}, the name which Babel claims for herself, "from which it further follows that עַד has not the meaning of 'endless time.'" [1] And if, finally, v.[6] proceeds, "*Great is the government and peace without end, upon the throne of David and over his kingdom, forasmuch as he establisheth it and upholdeth it with righteous judgment from henceforth even for ever,*" one may, of course, think of the court style of address which was generally employed in Babylonia and Egypt in describing kings, and which had probably penetrated to Israel as well: but a mythological, and therefore a foreign, origin of the Messianic expectation has so far at all events not been proved. For if Gressmann attempts to support it by saying that the anointing, from which the Messiah subsequently (!) derives his name, plays absolutely no part, this presupposes that that rite was transferred from the *Deity* to the king; but that is only a conjecture.

Gressmann, however, at this point postulates for the

[1] *Jesaja*, 93.

divine child a divine mother as well, and supposes that he can identify with her the עַלְמָה of Is 7^{14} and the יוֹלֵדָה of Mic 5^{2}. I believe that I have, on p. 143 f. above, given a more natural explanation of the former term, and, on that basis, of the latter also; nor do I understand why the expression "travail of the Messiah," already referred to, should not have from the very first the figurative sense in which it is employed in the Gospels and later.[1] Gunkel[2] and Gressmann no doubt think that the expression can be explained by Rev 12^{2}, where the sun-woman cries out travailing in birth; and the latter scholar finds here at the same time a proof that the mother of the Messiah is mythological in character, even in the prophets. But this tradition, which we shall have to examine more closely on a later page, is not early enough to justify such conclusions; and even the expression "travail of the Messiah" (which is also late) can hardly be explained by that tradition. For although, as we shall see, in the parallel myth regarding the birth of Apollo much is said of the travail of Leto, here we are concerned with that of the *Messiah*. Since in the Babylonian court style Ishtar is designated as the mother of the king, Gressmann thinks of that goddess, and explains by her number (fifteen) the seven shepherds and eight princes of Mic 5^{4}: but on p. 144 above we have again found a much more plausible explanation. Finally, the ancient Eastern myth of the Redeemer-king born of a virgin—which, according to Jeremias,[3] has had an influence here—exists thus far only in his imagination.

Yet Gressmann and Oesterley have still other proofs for their theses which might carry more conviction. The words of Is 9^{4}: "*All the shoes of those that are shod in the tumult of war, and the garments rolled in blood, are burned as fuel of fire,*" they explain as referring to a return of the golden age; still more what follows in the second Messianic passage, $11^{1ff.}$: "*And the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And*

[1] Cp. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 173.
[2] *Schöpfung*, 271.
[3] *Babylonisches*, 47.

the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the basilisk's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Gunkel also decides for this interpretation; and for this eschatological employment of myths regarding the primal age he refers in the same connexion (like Gressmann [1]) to Jer 4^{23}, where the coming destruction of Jerusalem is described by the well-known words from Gn 1^2 תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ: but this argument is as far from being conclusive as the interpretation given of Is 9^4 $11^{6ff.}$ is from being inevitable. Even the late passages cited by Bousset [2] need not be understood in this sense, though in this period one hears occasionally [3] of an appearance of Paradise and the Tree of Life. If the myth of the golden age is of foreign origin,[4] it does not necessarily follow that this is true from the very first of the Messianic hope, even though in later times that hope is occasionally combined with the alleged expectation that the golden age will return. Gressmann, in fact, believes that he has even found in the Indo-Iranian religion [5] a clear analogy to the *Israelitish* idea of the return of the primal age: but, in the first place, what we find there is a union of the pious with Yama or Yima, the first man, immediately after death; and, secondly, the indebtedness of Israel to this idea, at any rate in Isaiah's days, is hardly admissible. Even if in the court style the ruling prince is extolled as the bringer of a time of prosperity, that does not point to the belief in a return of the golden age, any more than the designation of the Messiah as Eternal Father: nowhere in the passages hitherto discussed does He appear as "Primal Man." How far this speculation has influenced eschatology in later times, we shall see in its own place: for the present, we have to examine one last

[1] *Ursprung*, 147. [2] *Religion*, 298 ff.; cp. 558.

[3] Cp. the short account in Volz, *Eschatologie*, 377.

[4] Cp. also Gunkel, *Genesis*, 100 f.

[5] Cp. Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, 1894, 532 ff.; also Söderblom, *La vie future*, 175 ff.

proof which Gunkel and Gressmann attempt to furnish for their theory.

In the Psalms there is frequent mention of Jahweh going up to heaven and ascending the throne ($47^{6.9}$ 93^{1} 97^{1} 99^{1}). Since this is more like the act of a human being, and since, on the other hand, the Messiah is said to be represented as God, Gressmann supposes that behind both of these there stood originally *one* figure. Gunkel[1] cites also the numerous New Testament passages which speak of an exaltation of Jesus, and which certainly are based on Ps 110^{1}: and he believes, with Zimmern,[2] that beneath them there lies the Babylonian idea of an ascension of the deities of light into heaven. But there is nothing said in Babylonia of an ascension "*to the right hand of God*"; and besides, Gressmann's hypothesis would be admissible only if his other proofs were sound—which they are not. The Messiah is the king of the last days, who is looked for because men assume that there will be a restoration of the earlier power of Israel: we need not therefore search after a foreign prototype for Him.

If it should be said that there may still have been such a prototype, it was not at all events present in Egyptian belief. Gunkel, indeed, observes that a passage of Messianic import appears among the prophecies of an Egyptian sage in the Leyden Papyrus, i. 344; and accordingly the Judaeo-Christian expectation is derived by E. Meyer[3] from Egypt, just as it is derived by Jeremias[4] from the "ancient Eastern theory of the universe [*Weltanschauung*]." But, as A. H. Gardiner's[5] closer study has shown, the Papyrus deals only with the expectation of a better future in general, not in the last days.

There is no need to do more than call to mind what an influence Is 53 has exerted in the New Testament on the interpretation of Jesus' death. But we must inquire in detail whether this figure of the Servant of Jahweh has its origin outside the religion of Israel.

[1] *Verständnis*, 71 f. [2] *Keilinschriften*, 389 f.

[3] "Die Mosessagen u. die Lewiten," *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1905, 651 f.

[4] *Panbabylonisten*, 49 f.

[5] *The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage*, 1909; cp. also Wiedemann, *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1910, 350 f.

Gressmann,[1] who maintains this thesis also, again following Gunkel,[2] as Gunkel follows Zimmern,[3] appeals in support of it to the obscurity of the passage. But, as the commentaries show, and as I, therefore, need not fully prove, that obscurity can be brought within very narrow limits. No doubt, if by the Servant an individual person had to be understood, it would be natural to accept a mythological origin, since the expectation of the resurrection of even one human being could hardly be explained otherwise. I cannot, however, persuade myself of that necessity, and the motive for such an interpretation therefore disappears. Nothing is proved by the argument that a hymn, which could have been sung each year by the initiated worshippers on the day when a Nature-god like Adonis or Attis had died, would have announced his resurrection in the same way as our chapter; and even Gressmann himself would derive Is 53 from such a source, only if at the same time the expiatory and sacrificial character of the Servant could be explained. But that is not reached, as a thing self-evident, by saying that men have thought that they could interpret the death of Balder (!) in this way. Zimmern cites an interesting text from the library of Assurbanipal, in which a righteous sufferer gives affecting expression to his feelings of distress, and then in a short concluding sentence declares his confident hope that he will be delivered from these sufferings: but no expiatory significance is there attached to them, and, further, it is not a god but a man that is concerned. Thus not even the *form* of Is 53 can be derived, as it is by Jeremias,[4] from a foreign source. Or ought one to regard that as possible on the ground that, according to the passage in Firmicus Maternus (*De Err. Prof. Rel.* 27), cited above on p. 105, a lamb was offered in the mysteries of Attis—and the Servant, like a lamb that is led to the slaughter, opened not his mouth? Even Zec 12[10] "*They shall look upon him whom they have pierced*," does not refer to a suffering Messiah or the like, but certainly to a

[1] *Ursprung*, 321 ff.: cp. also Brückner, *Gottheiland*, 41; Maurenbrecher, *Von Nazareth nach Golgatha* [sic], 1909, 57 ff.

[2] *Verständnis*, 78. [3] *Keilinschriften*, 384 ff.

[4] *Das A.T.* 92, 575 f. [Eng. trans. i. 100, ii. 278].

historical martyr, most probably the High Priest Onias III., "who was the head of the strict orthodox party, was deposed in the year 175, and in the year 170 was stabbed by a hired assassin acting on instructions from Jerusalem."[1] That v.[9] deals with an eschatological situation, is no proof to the contrary: the pouring out of the spirit which is expected for "that day," is to produce this very understanding of an actual crime. Neither is v.[11] "*In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem as the mourning of* [*or for*] *Hadadrimmon*" (certainly a Babylonian god) "*in the valley of Megiddon*," appropriate to the interpretation we are rejecting, although an appeal is so confidently made to it: for if v.[10] announced the lament for an "Adonis-figure" of eschatology, it would go without saying that it must be similar to the lament for Hadadrimmon. Gunkel believes, further, that he can explain even the idea of a death and a resurrection of the *Messiah* by a myth which he supposes to have existed in Jewish belief: but, as no positive proof for such intermediation is afforded by the single passage 2 Es 7[29] (which says that the Messiah would die at the end of the precursory years of rejoicing), I reserve the whole theory for later discussion.

We have still to explain one other designation of Jesus, which is employed or assumed in the most different parts of the New Testament—the title Son of Man. It is found most frequently in the Gospels, but in the Acts of the Apostles also the dying Stephen is represented as saying: "*I see the Son of man standing on the right hand of God*" (7[56]). Further, Paul probably knows the name when in 1 Co 15[27] he applies to Jesus the saying of Ps 8[7] "*He put all things in subjection under his feet*" (because that is spoken of בֶּן־אָדָם); so, too, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (2[8]) and the writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians (1[22]); and, finally, the Apocalypse (1[13]) describes Jesus as a *Son of man*. In the passages first referred to (with the exception of one or two) the expression cannot be understood as "man in general," but must primarily signify the Messiah appearing for judgment, whether it be that it is only put into Jesus' mouth, or,

[1] Marti, *Dodekapropheton*, 447.

as I firmly believe, that He Himself employed it. And, in fact, the term is found in this sense in Jewish thought, viz. in the Book of Enoch (46$^{2ff.}$ 48^{3} 62$^{5.\,7.\,9.\,14}$ 63^{11} 69$^{26ff.}$ 70^{1} 71$^{14.\,17}$) and in 2 Esdras (13$^{3ff.}$). Both recall Dn 7^{13}, where, however, the term Son of Man must mean the people of the saints (v.^{27}), and accordingly it is often supposed even now that the expression has arisen through a misunderstanding of this passage. But that is impossible, for two reasons. In the first place, one would only have taken out of it what was in some way present in it; but Enoch as well as 2 Esdras can say much more about the Son of Man. And, in the second place, the term, like the account of "the beasts," even in Daniel goes back to an earlier tradition: for the coming on the clouds of heaven, which is predicted of him, is not at all appropriate to Israel, and is therefore subsequently left unexplained. But what then is the original meaning of the term Son of Man?

N. Schmidt,[1] Grill,[2] Völter,[3] Cheyne,[4] Porter,[5] Gressmann,[6] and Bertholet[7] attempt to show that he is an angelic being. But when in Dn 8^{15} Gabriel is described as one who had the appearance of a man, that is nothing unusual, as even Gressmann admits, and in this passage it is specially natural, because previously there had been mention of beasts. If he is, then, in 9^{21} called the man Gabriel, that simply points back to 8^{15}: in fact the writer himself adds, "*whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning.*" Further, the description of the Son of Man in Enoch 46^{1} "*His face was full of graciousness like one of the holy angels,*" is to be judged in precisely the same way as the corresponding remark regarding David, 1 S 29^{9}, or Stephen, Ac 6^{15}; and if, as one must admit, divine functions are attributed to the Son of Man in Enoch

[1] "The Son of Man in the Book of Daniel," *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*, 1900, 22 ff.; art. "Son of Man," *Enc. Bibl.* iv., 1903, 4710.

[2] *Untersuchungen*, i. 50 ff.

[3] "Der Menschensohn in Dan. 7^{13}," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1902, 173 f.

[4] *Bible Problems*, 215 ff. [5] *The Message*, 131 ff.

[6] *Ursprung*, 342 ff.

[7] *Daniel*, 51. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, 177, n. 1, only supposes that even before the time of Daniel the figure of the man had been transformed into an angel of Jahweh.

and likewise in 2 Esdras, that still proves nothing for the *origin* of the conception. Again, there are no cogent grounds for thinking of the Persian Khshathra-Vairya, described by Jackson [1] as the most abstract and least material of all six personifications. Also, the god who in the myth of Labbu is said to make a cloud gather, who is said to kill Labbu and then exercise kingship, has no relevant place in this argument, although, according to Jensen, he is the same as Tishhu,[2] who at one point is described as *ramku*, "washed"; "and a synonym of this word is *pashīshu*, which denotes 'an anointed one'": [3] but the Son of Man in Dn 7 is not at all so designated. Gunkel,[4] whose view is shared by Zimmern,[5] Bousset,[6] Jeremias,[7] and H. Schmidt,[8] supposes that since the man of 2 Es $13^{3.\ 25.\ 51}$ rises up from the midst of the sea, he may perhaps have been originally a star-god; but even Gressmann rejects this as uncertain, and explains that feature as possibly borrowed from Dn $7^{2f.}$. We must, therefore, in order to discover the origin of the conception "Son of Man," take a longer and more difficult road.

Paul seems to be acquainted with still another speculation relating to some pre-eminent man. For when in 1 Co $15^{45ff.}$ he supports his doctrine of the resurrection with the quotation: "*The first man Adam became a living soul. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit*"—and when he adds: "*That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; then that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is of heaven*"—this is perhaps not explained by the immediate purpose of the whole discussion, which is, to render the resurrection intelligible. Paul is opposing a view which, on the other hand, represented the spiritual or heavenly man as the first, and the psychic or

[1] In Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss*, ii. 638.

[2] In regard to the reading of this name, cp. Jensen, *Gilgameschepos*, i. 139, n. 3.

[3] Jensen, *ibid.* 201; cp. 845. Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 391, 499, thinks, on the other hand, that the god is Bel(-Marduk): also Bertholet, *Daniel*, 48, is in general agreement with this.

[4] In Kautzsch's *Apokryphen*, ii. 397, note u.

[5] *Keilinschriften*, 392.

[6] *Religion*, 303, n. 1.

[7] *Babylonisches*, 41.

[8] *Jona*, 184 ff.

earthy man as the second. We find this view in Philo (*De Opif. Mundi*, 46 f., ed. Mangey, i. 32), who seeks his proof [1] in the twofold account of the creation, Gn 1 f. But Philo cannot have borrowed the idea from Genesis—any more than from Plato (*Symp.* 189 E), with whom, it is true, not only Philo but also the Rabbis have affinities. Such a speculation regarding the Primal Man must, on the contrary, have been present in Jewish thought; and, in fact, as Gunkel [2] and Tennant [3] in particular have shown, we find traces of it even in the Old Testament. In Ezk 28 the fall of the king of Tyre is described: the picture, however, contains many features which the prophet cannot possibly have invented for that monarch. For it is said of him (v.[13f.]): "*Thou wast in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering; . . . thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire.*" The succeeding context also alludes, I think, to a myth regarding the Primal Man, to which there is a veiled reference [4] as well in the question put by Eliphaz in Job 15[7f.] "*Art thou the first man that was born? Or wast thou brought forth before the hills? Hast thou heard the secret counsel of God? And dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?*" Can this myth, which is obviously non-Israelitish, be shown to have existed elsewhere?

Gunkel,[5] Zimmern,[6] Jastrow,[7] Wünsche,[8] Böklen [9] compare the Babylonian myth of Adapa—chiefly, it is true, with Gn 3; Zimmern, like Sayce,[10] would even reckon with the

[1] Cp. Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandrien als Ausleger des A.T.s*, 1875, 284. In regard to the Rabbis, cp. Schiele, "Die rabb. Parallelen zu 1 Kor. 15[45-50]," *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1899, 120 ff.

[2] *Schöpfung*, 148; *Genesis*, 28 f.

[3] *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*, 1903, 61 ff.; cp. also Bousset, *Religion*, 405.

[4] Pr 30[4] *What is his name, and what is his son's name?* does not seem to me to be so clear.

[5] *Genesis*, 33.

[6] In Gunkel's *Schöpfung*, 148, n. 3, 151; "Lebensbrot und Lebenswasser im Babylonischen u. in der Bibel," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1899, 165 ff.; *Keilinschriften*, 520 ff.

[7] *Religion*, 551 ff.

[8] *Schöpfung u. Sündenfall des ersten Menschenpaares*, 1906, 72 ff.

[9] *Adam u. Kain im Lichte der vergleichenden Mythenforschung*, 1907, 41.

[10] *Academy*, 1892, xlii. 72.

possibility that Adam as a proper name is derived from Adapa. It is, of course, not yet certain that Adapa is really the Primal Man: at all events, Zimmern in his earlier writings appealed in proof of this only to a fragment of a clay-tablet from the library of Assurbanipal, where Adapa is either directly called the seed or sprout of humanity, or is somehow brought into relation with the Primal Man: but in Zimmern's last publication there is no mention of this. The question must therefore remain open, although Bousset perhaps goes too far when he says: "The Babylonian myth of Adapa hardly belongs to this connexion."[1]

Bousset himself thinks, on the other hand, of Parsism, in which the Primal Man, in the double form of Gâyômard and Yima (already mentioned on p. 147), appears as a godlike being.[2] This reference, in fact, seems particularly natural, because it is even said of Gâyômard in *Bund.* 30. 7 (*Sacred Books*, v. 123) that he would be the first to rise from the dead. Such an eschatological employment of a speculation regarding the primal age would be in complete accord with the beginning of the same chapter (v. 1 ff., *Sacred Books*, v. 120 f.): for there it is said that before the coming of Saoshyant (of whom we shall hear more definitely later) men will again, as in the primal age, live only on milk, vegetables, and finally water. But although the description of the kingdom of Yima resembles that given in Commodian (*Instr.* ii. 1, *Carm. Apol.* 941 ff.) of the land of the deported ten tribes, I should hardly, with Böklen[3] and Bousset,[4] conclude from this that the Son of Man, with whom the ten tribes are to reappear (2 Es 13^{12}),

[1] *Religion*, 407, n. 2. The matter is put differently in the 1st edition, p. 349: "Also a Babylonian myth of the Primal Man . . . perhaps deserves consideration in this connexion."

[2] Grill, *Untersuchungen*, i. 70, n. 3, says: "It is natural to think of the later Iranian conception of the Fravashis . . . and the question might be raised whether this feature has not perhaps in a subordinate degree affected Dn 7": but the similarity is too slight. The same remark applies to one of the parallels to which Moffatt calls attention (*Hibb. Journ.*, 1903–4, ii. 351), viz. between the description of the Son of Man as *girt about at the breasts with a golden girdle* (Rev 1^{13}), and that of Vayu in *Yt.* 15. 54, 57 (*Sacred Books*, xxiii. 261 f.), where alongside of other attributes there also appears *high up girded, of the golden girdle.*

[3] *Verwandtschaft*, 136 ff.

[4] *Religion*, 558.

is also derived from Parsism. We have, however, already seen that in Parsism also the conflict with the serpent is to be repeated in the last days. We must, therefore, consider more closely whether the idea of the Son of Man has not actually the same origin.

In the Naassenic sermon, an extract of which has been preserved by Hippolytus (*Philos.* v. 9 f.), Reitzenstein,[1] with the support of Wendland[2] and Bousset,[3] has proved that we possess the heathen commentary, revised in a Gnostic-Christian sense, upon a hymn to Attis, which is quoted at the end. In both hymn and commentary, Attis is identified with other gods or heroes and also with the first man: indeed the commentary is properly a treatise on this subject. First of all, however, the "Chaldaean" doctrine is set forth in considerable detail, and here (as also repeatedly in the later part) the heavenly is distinguished from the first man. Thus there is actual evidence that the "Chaldaeans" held this view: it is shown also by the fact that the apologist Aristides charges them with originating the doctrine of the divinity of man.[4] By the "Chaldaeans" one must more definitely understand the Persians: this is proved by the rest of the description given of their religion, with which the notice from Herodotus, cited above on p. 109, shows a remarkable agreement.[5]

Again, this origin of the doctrine of the Primal Man is confirmed by one characteristic which it displays in the Poimandres, and to which Bousset[6] has called attention. There (16) it is said of him that he begat seven men, androgynous and sublime; in the same way, from the seed of Gâyômard there springs the first pair of human beings, then from them spring seven other pairs.

Still, the clearest evidence is that given by Zosimus, an alchemistic writer belonging to the end of the third or the

[1] *Poimandres*, 81 ff.; cp. his previous work, *Zwei rel.-gesch. Fragen*, 96.

[2] *Berl. philol. Wochenschr.*, 1902, 1324.

[3] *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1905, 698 f.; *Hauptprobleme*, 183 ff.

[4] Cp. Geffcken, *Apologeten*, 57.

[5] In regard to this later phraseology, cp. also Bousset, *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1901, 246; *Hauptprobleme*, 224 f., 375 ff.

[6] *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1905, 701 f.; *Hauptprobleme*, 183.

beginning of the fourth century, whom again Reitzenstein has cited. Zosimus appeals directly in support of his views, among which is a doctrine of the Primal Man very similar to what we find in the Poimandres, not only to Hermes but also to Zoroaster, *i.e.*, of course, to apocryphal writings of Zoroaster, which, however, are certainly connected with Parsism. And Bousset [1] observes that Gnostics, whose views Plotinus contested, have in the same way, according to Porphyrius (*Vita Plot.* 16), appealed to such writings: it is likely, in view of *Ennead.* ii. 9. 10, that they also maintained the doctrine of the Primal Man.

Finally, Reitzenstein [2] has with extraordinary acuteness found in two "lychnomantic" [3] charms or conjurations [*Lichtzaubern*], to which he has called attention, proofs for the Persian origin of the doctrine of the Primal Man. In the one of these the sorcerer, who generally represents himself as the god whom he invokes, says: *φάνηθί μοι, κύριε, τῷ πρὸ πυρὸς καὶ χιόνος προόντι καὶ μετόντι, ὅτι ὄνομά μοι βαϊνχωωωχ. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πεφυκὼς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, *i.e.* probably the Primal Man. One is therefore bound to think of the Primal Man also in the other conjuration, which is entirely similar: *ἀναφάνηθι καὶ δὸς ἐντροπὴν τῷ φανέντι πρὸ πυρὸς καὶ χιόνος βαϊνχωωωχ· σὺ γὰρ κατέδειξας φῶς καὶ χιόνα.* It is very probable that the mention of fire and snow points to Persia, where the only seasons recognized were summer and winter.

What we find regarding a godlike Primal Man in the Gnostics,[4] in the Pseudo-Clementine writings, in Mandaeism and Manichaeism, however important it may be as a proof of the existence of such a speculation, is still of no consequence for the question of its origin, and therefore need not be examined: it is the more unnecessary, since Bousset [5] has recently produced one study of the subject and Gressmann [6]

[1] *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1905, 700. [2] *Poimandres*, 280.

[3] [I have not found the term "lychnomantic" in any English work, but "lychnomancie" is used in Daremberg and Saglio's *Dict. des Antiquités* (iii. 1517) for some process of divination by lamps. Cp. p. 349 below.—Tr.]

[4] To that source we can also ascribe the Magical Papyrus cited by Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 279 f.

[5] *Hauptprobleme*, 160 ff. [6] *Ursprung*, 364.

has announced another. So far as we are concerned, the Persian origin of the doctrine in question has been made sufficiently plausible by the arguments adduced above.

On the other hand, a connexion with Indian speculations, such as Grill,[1] N. Schmidt,[2] O. Pfleiderer,[3] Bousset[4] regard as not unlikely, appears to me on general grounds inadmissible. And as regards the details, one may note that the Purusha, *i.e.* Primal Man, of the Rig Veda has nothing in common with the Son of Man in Jewish and Christian thought: no more has the heavenly essence of Buddha, which is designated by the same name and is presupposed in the various incarnations. Finally, when *Krishna* as the avatar of Vish*nu* is called also Vish*nu*-Nârâya*na*, *i.e.* the man-like, that is something quite different: apart from this, we shall have to inquire later whether this whole idea of the incarnation of a god does not, on the contrary, spring from Christianity.

Further, I should hardly find in Parsism "an indubitable, if a somewhat general, analogy" to the idea of the pre-existence of the Messiah, at all events not in that doctrine of which Böklen[5] thinks. According to *Yt.* 13. 62 (*Sacred Books*, xxiii. 195) and *Bund.* 32. 8 f. (*ibid.* v. 144), the seed from which Saoshya*nt* and his two precursors are to spring, is already in existence: but that is manifestly something quite different from the Judaeo-Christian idea. Perhaps, however, some details, if not in Jewish, at any rate in primitive Christian, thought, may be derived from the doctrine of the Primal Man which is attested in Hippolytus and the Poimandres, and these may therefore be briefly discussed.

Reitzenstein[6] compares with the man whom Esdras describes as coming up from the midst of the sea (2 Es $13^{3.\ 25.\ 51}$) the man Oannes mentioned in the Naassenic sermon, of whom the same is said: but the latter appears there not as the Primal Man, but only as the first man. Nowhere is anything like this asserted of the former, and

[1] *Untersuchungen*, i. 346 ff.
[2] *Enc. Bibl.* iv. 4737.
[3] *Christusbild*, 24 f. [Eng. trans. 35 f.].
[4] *Hauptprobleme*, 209 ff.
[5] *Verwandtschaft*, 91 ff.
[6] *Poimandres*, 109, n. 4.

we have already seen (p. 152) how the statement in 2 Esdras is probably to be explained.

Again, Paul's statements in 1 Co $15^{47.\ 49}$: "*The second man is of heaven. . . . As we have borne the image* (εἰκόνα) *of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly,*" if taken by themselves, may be very well understood without appealing to the doctrine of the Primal Man, in the particular form in which that doctrine meets us in the Naassenic sermon. Paul may without extraneous aid have designated the exalted Christ (whom we are to resemble in the resurrection), in contrast with Adam (who according to Gn 2^{7} is formed of the dust of the earth), as the "second man of heaven," and have said of Him that we should bear His image, just as, according to Gn 5^{3}, we had borne the image of Adam. But now that we have seen that he has previously assailed the doctrine of a spiritual Primal Man, it is certainly possible that his account of the spiritual man (in *his* sense of the term) is modelled on the very theory which he assailed. And, in fact, not only is the Primal Man called in Hippolytus ὁ ἄνω or ἄνωθεν ἄνθρωπος, but the first man is described as his counterpart (εἰκών).

But it is chiefly in the Christological statement of Ph $2^{6f.}$ that Paul seems to me to be indebted to the doctrine of the Primal Man, in the form in which we find it in the Poimandres. What he there says regarding the pre-existent Christ, "*He was in the form of God*" (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ), is usually explained by Gn 1^{27}, where צֶלֶם might be rendered by μορφή. But that is not the Greek word usually employed: and, in particular, we have seen above that Paul proves from Genesis that the spiritual or heavenly man is the second; he cannot therefore have found him in chap. 1. This, however, does not exclude the possibility that, as in 1 Co he may have applied the theory of the Primal Man to the exalted Christ, so here he may have applied it to the pre-existent Christ; and since in the *Poimandres* (12) the Primal Man is actually called the form (μορφή) of God, that view is perhaps not improbable on this evidence alone. But still more remarkable is the similarity between the Poimandres and Paul's second statement, "*He took the form of a servant*

and was made in the likeness of man." These words may, in default of a better interpretation, be explained by one of the succeeding phrases, "*He became obedient even unto death*"; but it is perhaps more natural to find a solution in the following circumstance. According to the *Poimandres* (15), the first man also, being as we have seen the offspring of the Primal Man and Nature, was, properly speaking, exalted above destiny, but still became its servant (*ἀθάνατος ὢν καὶ πάντων τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἔχων τὰ θνητοῦ πάσχει ὑποκείμενος τῇ εἱμαρμένῃ· ὑπεράνω γὰρ ὢν τῆς ἁρμονίας ἐναρμόνιος γέγονε δοῦλος*). It is not for a moment suggested that Paul is indebted even to earlier and less complete forms of the Naassenic sermon or of the Poimandres: my argument is only that the myth of the Primal Man appears to have determined the *form* of some of his Christological statements. In that case, however, it is one degree more probable that the *expression* Son of Man has the same origin: but the expectation which it primarily indicates of a Messiah *coming to judge the world* is connected with the transcendentalism of which we spoke on p. 82. It is therefore unwarrantable to say, with Gruppe,[1] that Jesus seems to have been partially influenced by pagan ideas in His consciousness of the greatness of His appointed task.

We have already seen that dualism probably owed its rise in some measure to Persian influence. There is one further confirmation of this, with which we now become acquainted. As in numerous passages in the New Testament and in Jewish literature,[2] so also in Mazdean belief a victory over Satan is expected at the end of the days—a victory, it is commonly supposed, that will be won by a Messiah, Saoshyant.[3] Even in some of the details there are affinities between the two views, so that here we can confidently affirm an influence of Parsism on Judaism.

I should not, however, in spite of the authority of Böklen[4]

[1] *Mythologie*, 1611.

[2] Cp. the short account in Bousset, *Religion*, 287 ff.

[3] In regard to the name, cp. Casartelli, "The Zoroastrian Messiah," *Hibb. Journ.*, 1906–7, v. 435 f., who opposes Smythe Palmer, "The Zoroastrian Messiah," *ibid.* 156 ff., 674.

[4] *Verwandtschaft*, 129 f.

and Bousset,[1] compare with one another the two following passages—*Bund.* 30. 30 (*Sacred Books*, v. 129), where it is said that Ahura Mazda will overcome Angra Mainyu by means of a magical formula; and 2 Th 2^8, where we are told that Christ will, with the breath of His mouth, slay the lawless one, who undoubtedly is an emissary of the devil: for this last expression comes from Is 11^4. But the downfall of the dragon (Rev $12^{9.13}$ $20^{3.10}$) distinctly recalls the expulsion of the evil spirit into darkness, *Bund.* 1. 22, 3. 26, 30. 30 (*Sacred Books*, v. 8 f., 19, 129). Of course, the first two passages from the Bundahis refer to an earlier victory over the devil; but as we have (on p. 137) adduced the passage 3. 10 ff. (*Sacred Books*, v. 17)—which has the same reference—in explanation of Rev 12^4, we are probably justified in thinking of them in this connexion also. And, in fact, it is perhaps by this supposition of a double victory over the evil spirit and Azi Dahâka (*Bund.* 29. 8 f., *Sacred Books*, v. 119), that one is to explain the corresponding expectation in the Apocalypse, as well as in the late passage, Is 24^{22}. Accordingly, not only Stave [2] and Bousset,[3] but also Söderblom [4] and Cheyne,[5] have affirmed an influence of Parsism in this matter on Judaism and primitive Christianity. "Il est incontestable," Söderblom justly remarks, "que les doctrines de la captivité du diable, 'l'ancien serpent,' suivie de la courte période de liberté et celle de l'Antichrist, ne peuvent être reconnues comme un développement direct de l'expérience qu' avaient eue les prophètes de la ruine morale et de la misère de la vie, ruine et misère qui réclamaient l'intervention de Jahvéh." [6]

This distinction between two acts of the eschatological drama, which we find not only in the Apocalypse but also in Paul's Epistles (1 Co 15^{28}), and already in Jewish thought,[7] is certainly to be explained by the parallelism of the earlier or prophetic view on the one hand, with the later or apocalyptic view on the other. The fact that, though many intermediate

[1] *Religion*, 589. [2] *Einfluss*, 176. [3] *Offenbarung*, 436.
[4] *La vie future*, 303. [5] *Bible Problems*, 209 ff.
[6] Other parallels are cited by W. Bauer, *Handkommentar*, iv. 492.
[7] Cp. the short account in Bousset, *Religion*, 330 ff.

forms existed, these two views were occasionally put side by side as irreconcilable, I should not regard as in itself a proof of the foreign origin of the latter: but since we have just been forced to posit an influence of Parsism in this matter also, one certainly seems justified in holding that that influence was still more widespread. This can, in fact, be shown to be probable, and even certain, in regard to various points.

To begin with, it is perhaps not accidental that, as in Mt $24^{40f.}$, Lk $17^{34f.}$, so also in *Bund.* 30. 15 (*Sacred Books*, v. 124), it is declared that there will be on the day of judgment a severing of the closest ties. The circumstance, moreover, that the kingdom of Yima, according to *Yt.* 9. 10 = 17. 30 (*Sacred Books*, xxiii. 112, 276), lasts for a thousand years, though this period belongs to the past, not to the future, has perhaps affected the duration assigned to the Messianic reign in the Apocalypse ($20^{3f.}$): but this may, of course, be due to other causes. Nothing conclusive, therefore, is reached till we come to the following evidence.

Paul perhaps assumes that this world will perish by burning, when in 2 Th 1^{8} he represents Jesus as being revealed in flaming fire (ἐν πυρὶ φλογός). For special reasons I postpone the discussion of 1 Co $3^{13.\ 15}$: and nothing need be said in the first instance of the "lake of fire" in Rev 19^{20} $20^{10.\ 14f.}$ 21^{8}. But Rev 21^{1} "*The first heaven and the first earth are passed away; and the sea is no more,*" is probably relevant to our present subject. And, above all, we read of such a destruction of the world in 2 P $3^{7.\ 10ff.}$.

This view was already present in Jewish thought, especially in the Sibylline Oracles; in fact, according to Böklen,[1] Bousset,[2] Gunkel,[3] and above all Gressmann,[4] it is found even in the Old Testament. Söderblom,[5] writing before these other scholars, argued that it is *not* in the Old Testament; and so far as we have not to do with after-effects of the old conception of the volcano-god, we may suppose that the passages

[1] *Verwandtschaft*, 121, n. 1.

[2] *Religion*, 322, n. 1, 573: "As far as pre-exilic Old Testament prophecy is concerned, the idea of a universal conflagration seems to me to be clearly found first in Zephaniah."

[3] *Verständnis*, 22.

[4] *Ursprung*, 49 f., 145 ff.

[5] *La vie future*, 281 ff.

are only poetical descriptions. As for a popular belief in a general catastrophe—such as Gressmann supposes—it is only the very opposite that can be proved: "Micah ben-Imlah, who was accustomed to prophesy nothing good, was opposed by four hundred prophets of Jahweh who predicted success to the king: Jeremiah calls his prophetic opponents and enemies prophets of security, and therefore lying prophets"; and it is impossible to gloss this over, as Gressmann attempts to do. His thesis of the pre-prophetic origin of Jewish eschatology shows itself even here to be untenable, and it will therefore in all likelihood be one day abandoned by those who originally approved of it.

If, therefore, it is only at a later period that the idea of a universal conflagration can be shown to have existed in Israel, it cannot have arisen there from the earlier notion, to which we have just referred, of Jahweh as a volcano-god, but must have come from a volcanic land, where it was already in existence. And this land is again Persia: in fact, this expectation appears there even in its details in a form which at the same time explains many other passages, which we have not yet mentioned, in Jewish and early Christian literature.

In *Bund.* 30. 19 f., 31 (*Sacred Books*, v. 125 f., 129)—the preceding context has been already referred to on pp. 141, 160—we read: "*Afterwards the fire and halo melt the metal of Shatvaîrô, in the hills and mountains, and it remains on this earth like a river. Then all men will pass into that melted metal and will become pure; when one is righteous, then it seems to him just as though he walks continually in warm milk; but when wicked, then it seems to him in such manner as though, in the world, he walks continually in melted metal. . . . Gôkîhar burns the serpent in the melted metal, and the stench and pollution which were in hell are burned in that metal, and it becomes quite pure.*" With this we may, as Böklen[1] shows, compare especially the passage in Dn $7^{10f.}$, which describes how at the judgment a fiery stream issues and spreads from the throne of God, and the beast is burned in it: similarly in the Apocalypse (19^{20} $20^{10.\ 14f.}$ 21^{8})

[1] *Verwandtschaft*, 119 f.

devil, beast, and false prophet are burned in the lake of fire. Further, in the Psalms of Solomon $15^{4f.}$ it is said of the pious man: "*Flaming fire* (φλὸξ πυρός) *and the wrath against the ungodly shall not touch him, when it goeth forth against the sinners from before the face of the Lord, to destroy all the substance of the sinners.*" And, finally, to this connexion we may refer 1 Co $3^{12ff.}$: "*But if any man buildeth on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble; each man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it is revealed in fire; and the fire itself shall prove each man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work shall abide which he built thereon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as through fire.*" Of course there is, I think, in primitive Christian teaching no suggestion of a purification of *all*:[1] both there and in Jewish thought the consciousness of guilt was too strong to admit of that. Thus the fire became for men a penal fire: but this very fact points again to foreign influence. It is far from probable that the conception was due merely to the circumstance that the worship of Moloch was celebrated in the Valley of Hinnom, the appointed place for the execution of criminals. Not that this would necessarily imply a borrowing from Egyptian religion;[2] and as for Babylonia, according to Zimmern[3] this idea cannot be shown to have existed there at all. It is true that *in later times* the notion of a universal conflagration to come was in Babylonia related to the belief in a deluge in the same way as we find it in 2 P $3^{5ff.}$: Berosus (as we are told in Seneca, *Nat. Qu.* iii. 29. 1) prognosticated a conflagration as well as a deluge. But according to Zimmern[4] there is no evidence of the *former*

[1] Bousset, *Religion*, 583, n. 1, says: "Söderblom also (243) regards it as possible that according to the Gâthas only the righteous are saved in the fiery judgment, while the wicked perish there." But this is a misunderstanding: Söderblom only says, "Pourtant il ne me semble pas qu'il soit prouvé que la résurrection et la purification de tous ne fussent pas déjà connues du temps des Gâthas."

[2] In regard to this, cp. Lieblein, *Egyptian Religion*, 1884, 84 f.; in regard to the expression "second death," cp. Miss A. Grenfell, *Monist*, 1906, 182 f.

[3] *Keilinschriften*, 643.

[4] *Ibid.* 560: cp. Cumont, *Textes*, i. 168 f.; Bousset, *Religion*, 573 f.

expectation among the Babylonians: the final conclusion, therefore, is that it is ultimately derived from Persia.

This settles the question of a Greek origin of this idea—a hypothesis maintained by B. Bauer[1] in his time, and lately, but of course on quite different grounds, by Dieterich.[2] No doubt the idea is to be found among the Stoics, connected even with the anticipation of a deluge:[3] but both, we may be sure, spring from the East. Of course it may have become known to the writer of the Second Epistle of Peter in that circuitous way; only, it was not originally Greek.

And still less can it be supposed to be of Indian origin, as van den Bergh van Eysinga[4] and Franke[5] maintain. The former scholar compares the two following passages—2 P 3[8. 10ff.]: "*Beloved, the day of the Lord will come as a thief; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth . . . shall be burned up. Seeing that these things are thus all to be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy living and godliness, looking for and earnestly desiring the coming of the day of God?*" and a passage in the preface to the *Ǧâtakas*: "*Friends . . . this system of worlds will be destroyed; even the mighty ocean will dry up; this great earth . . . will be burned up and destroyed, and the whole world, up to the realms of the immaterial angels, will pass away. Therefore, O friends, do mercy, live in kindness, and sympathy, and peace*":[6] and, in fact, the agreement of the two is at first sight most remarkable. But one need not think that the one description is dependent upon the other: and if dependence should still be asserted, it is probably the Christian passage which ought to be regarded as the original. Franke declares, it is true, that this universal conflagration is already indicated in the *Mahâ-parinibbâna-Sutta*, 1. 18

[1] *Christus*, 58. [2] *Nekyia*, 200.

[3] Cp. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 1. 156 f. [Eng. trans., *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, 159 f.]; von Arnim, *Stoic. Vet. Fragm.* ii. 181 ff.

[4] *Einflüsse*, 63 f. [5] *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2760 f.

[6] Cp. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Birth Stories*, i., 1880, 58. The passage from the *Aṅguttara-Nikâya*, vii. 62, quoted in the second edition of his work (p. 64 f.) and by van den Bergh van Eysinga in *Museum*, 1910, 303, is much less similar.

(*Sacred Books*, xi. 18), in Buddha's prediction that the town of Pâtaliputta would be destroyed by fire, water, and dissension; but he has not yet exhibited any proof of this. And one must not at all suppose that "the day of the Lord" "certainly" belongs to the same category as the days and nights of Brahmâ (in the Mahâbhârata and subsequent literature), during which the world arises and perishes.

Finally, a Persian origin is suggested also by the anticipation of a new heaven and a new earth, which we find in the New Testament (Mt 19^{28}, Rev 21^{1}, 2 P 3^{13}), in Jewish thought, and first of all in Is 65^{17} 66^{22}. By itself this might again, of course, be easily derived from a pessimistic outlook upon the present: but here also various details show, as Böklen[1] in particular has seen, that Persia had, at any rate, a collateral influence.

In view of the rough and mountainous character of the land, it was natural in Persia to expect in the last days an earth entirely level: with this we may connect the prediction in Zec 14^{10}: "*All the land from Geba to Rimmon south of Jerusalem shall be turned as the Arabah*," *i.e.* "the level floor of the great trough through which the Jordan flows"; and in the Sibylline Oracles (iii. 777 ff.): "*All the paths in the flat land and the rugged hillocks and the lofty hills and the raging billows shall be smooth and navigable in those days.*" The Apocalypse also, I think, proceeds from this assumption; otherwise it could not depict the new Jerusalem as it does in 21^{16}.

Further, not only the dwelling-place of the ten tribes, of which mention was incidentally made above (p. 154), but also the bliss of the pious, are described in Jewish and Christian literature in much the same terms as the kingdom of Yima in Mazdean thought. Yet this hardly calls for remark: only, if the *Vendîdâd* (2. 40, *Sacred Books*, iv. 20) should really speak of it as not lighted by sun, moon, and stars, we should be compelled to find in that passage the explanation of Is 60^{19}: "*The sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee: but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God*

[1] *Verwandtschaft*, 131 ff.

thy glory"; and of Rev $21^{23.\ 25}$ (22^{5}): "*The city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb.*" *Perhaps* the expectation of beholding God, which we find in Mt 5^{8} and Rev 22^{4}, comes partially from Mazdeism, for the Gâthas already contain it (*Ys.* 43. 3, *Sacred Books*, xxxi. 99). At one time J. Weiss[1] (like Völter[2]) connected the expression βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ with the name Khshathra-Vairya, one of the Amesha Spentas—a term which no doubt has the same meaning; but this explanation is no longer offered by him, and has probably been abandoned.[3]

Again, the expectation which we find in Jewish thought (Enoch $60^{7ff.}$, Apoc. Bar 29^{4}, 2 Es $6^{49ff.}$), that the flesh of primeval monsters will serve as the food of the righteous dead, should not, I think (*pace* Böklen[4] and Bousset[5]), be compared with the Persian idea of the food of immortality, consisting of the sap of the Haoma tree and the marrow of the ox Hadhayâs slain by Saoshyant. It would be better to compare with this last the more general idea, so often met in the Gospels, of a Messianic feast, which, according to Is 25^{6}, is also to consist of "*fat things full of marrow*" and of "*wines on the lees well refined.*" Moffatt[6] expresses this further opinion: "The fierce doom of Rev 19^{17-18}, where birds are called to devour the flesh of Messiah's foes, is paralleled by the supreme penalty inflicted on the carcases of those who resist Mazdeism, namely, that they be given over to corpse-eating birds (the ravens, *Vend.* 3. 20, 9. 49 [*Sacred Books*, iv. 27, 131]); although the Assyrian 'stele of the vultures' (before 3000 B.C.) offers an even closer coincidence, with its corpses of the foe lying bare on the field and devoured by vultures." Bousset[7] first refers, and rightly, to Ezk $39^{17ff.}$; but afterwards, following Gressmann,[8] he connects this idea with the myth regarding the end of Tiâmat, by which also he

[1] *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (1892), ²1900, 30 ff.
[2] *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1902, 174.
[3] So also Böhmer, "Reichgottesspuren in der Völkerwelt," *Beiträge zur Förderung christl. Theologie*, 1906, 1. 65 ff.
[4] *Verwandtschaft*, 113 f.
[5] *Religion*, 584, n. 2.
[6] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1903–4, ii. 352.
[7] *Offenbarung*, 433.
[8] *Ursprung*, 140.

would explain the other Old Testament passages just cited. But no plausible case can be made out for this explanation: from the dead body of Tiâmat, on the contrary, heaven and earth are formed: and the passages in Ezekiel and the Apocalypse stand in no need of a derivation from another religion.

The wall of the heavenly Jerusalem, Rev 21^{17}, might also be derived from Parsism: for in *Bund.* 3. 26 (*Sacred Books*, v. 19), after the description of the overthrow of the evil spirit, this sentence occurs: "*And the rampart of the sky was formed so that the adversary should not be able to mingle with it.*" However, this supposition is not necessary: it may simply have been assumed that the heavenly Jerusalem was certain to have a wall. Its absurdly low height is probably to be explained by the fact that here a different tradition is employed from that which was drawn upon for the reckoning of the dimensions of the heavenly city: the slender "parapet" on which, according to Bousset,[1] ancient accounts made the canopy of heaven rest, is a very different matter.

That the river which proceeds from the throne of God is the Milky Way, and that therefore the idea is originally Babylonian, was already indicated above (p. 102); and in the same way Zimmern[2] and Jeremias[3] compare with the river of the water of life and the tree of life (Ezk $47^{1ff.}$, Rev $22^{1ff.}$) the bread and water of life, to which there are frequent references in Babylonian thought. But this does not correspond so closely as the Persian description of the kingdom of Yima, which in other ways as well has influenced the representation of the felicity of the last days. For from it also proceed two great rivers, from which all fruitfulness on earth is derived; there grow in it, further, all manner of enchanted trees, and among them also the tree of life, of which, besides, it is said in *Bund.* 18. 1 (cp. 27. 4, *Sacred Books*, v. 65, 100): "*It is necessary as a producer of the renovation of the universe, for they prepare its immortality therefrom.*" Of course, the conception cannot come from

[1] *Offenbarung*, 448.
[2] *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1899, 165 ff.; *Keilinschriften*, 522 ff.
[3] *Das A.T.* 200 ff. [Eng. trans. i. 215 ff.]; *Babylonisches*, 73 ff.

Iran, for then it would not have been early enough to influence the story of the Garden of Eden. But in the points just noted, as Bousset [1] rightly observes, we have nothing but traces and allusions, which are hardly any longer intelligible: when the idea emerges more clearly in later times, it is as a new arrival, and it can then very well have come from Parsism. For Parsism has otherwise influenced Judaeo-Christian eschatology at the most various points.

(β) *The Life after Death.*—The doctrine of an afterlife for the individual, and an afterlife worthy of the name, appears in the New Testament in a twofold form. On the one hand a resurrection is expected at the end of the days, perhaps—that is, if there are supposed to be two acts of the eschatological drama—at two different times: on the other hand there is mention of an afterlife immediately succeeding death. In the parable of the Rich Man (Lk $16^{22ff.}$), in the saying from the Cross (23^{43}), "*To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise*," and in Paul's writings (2 Co $5^{1ff.}$, Ph 1^{23}), it is probably only an intermediate state that is referred to; according to the Gospel of John, however, the eternal life begins immediately after death, in fact before it.

In Jewish thought also we are already faced by this antinomy: on the one hand there is a resurrection expected at the end of the days, on the other hand an afterlife following immediately on death, whether man's lot there is final or only provisional. But in the Old Testament we find only the beginnings of the first view, and no trace of the second.[2]

Now it is certainly possible in the first instance to explain the one belief as well as the other, and even in their appearance at precisely such different times, by a development of religious thought within the Israelitish and Jewish people itself. Individualism, which was already a prominent feature in the teaching of the prophets, was bound of itself, at first in conjunction with the national hope, and afterwards even independently of it, to push into the foreground the belief in a life after death. And yet here as elsewhere it

[1] *Religion*, 557.

[2] Cp. the short account in Bousset, *Religion*, 334 ff.

remains possible to trace this development collaterally to foreign influences.

Delitzsch [1] points more definitely to Babylonia, where he thinks he can prove that there existed the conception of two divisions in the underworld, one for the righteous and one for the godless. But when at the close of the Epic of Gilgamesh these words occur: "*He who died in battle rests on a couch, drinks pure water; but he whose body is thrown in the field, his spirit has no rest on the earth*"—or if on clay cones that have recently come to light there is the expression of this desire for any one who will treat the tomb reverently: "*Above may his name be honoured, below may his shade drink clear water!*"—a difference is here drawn between restlessness and repose in the underworld, not between two conditions or receptacles within it.[2] The pure and clear water (which is presupposed in the same way in the underworld of the Egyptians and the Greeks [3]) may, of course, have given rise to the corresponding description in Enoch ($22^{2.9}$) and Luke (16^{24}); but otherwise the Babylonian parallels are of no importance for our present question. And still less, according to Zimmern,[4] can one at present discover in Babylonian literature a positive trace of belief in a resurrection. "From the exceptional removal of Utnapishtim to a divine life at the end of the deluge, or from expressions like that used by Gilgamesh, who fears that '*he will have to lay himself also to rest so as never more to arise in all the time to come*,' one might rather draw the opposite conclusion, viz. that the Babylonians did not believe that the dead man's lot in the underworld was ever altered. And the designations of that world, 'the land of return,' 'the house whose entrance is never an exit,' and the like, hardly attest the existence of a belief in a resurrection."

But, on the other hand, we find both conceptions of a life

[1] *Babel u. Bibel*, i. 38 ff. [Eng. trans. 56 ff.].

[2] As Radermacher, *Das Jenseits im Mythos der Hellenen*, 1903, 75, and Dieterich, "Mutter Erde," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1905, 42 f., remark, it is probably because drowned (and consequently unburied) persons do not reach the underworld that in Rev 20^{13} so much stress is laid on the circumstance that *the sea will give up the dead which are in it*.

[3] Cp. Dieterich, *Nekyia*, 95.

[4] *Keilinschriften*, 638 f.

after death in Parsism; for if the existence there of a belief in a resurrection has occasionally been called in question, it is certified by the statement of Theopompus,[1] preserved by Diogenes Laertius (*Prooem.* 6) and Aeneas of Gaza (*De Immort. An.*, ed. Barth, 77). Cheyne[2] controverts the supposition that Judaism has been influenced on this point, and urges that in Judaism originally no belief in immortality was to be found; but this fact has been already explained. And the arguments which Söderblom[3] has advanced against the same thesis are equally unconvincing.

Söderblom points first of all to the fact that the Parsic belief in a resurrection is based upon a myth regarding the destruction and the renovation of the world, and the Jewish one upon a religious-ethical need. But even if the former statement were accurate, it would still be possible that the conception was adopted by the Israelites and Jews for their own purposes.

Söderblom's second argument is that in Is 26^{19} a resurrection is expected only for the dead of Jahweh, and in Dn 12^{2} for many who sleep in the dust of the earth, not, as in Parsism, for all. This statement is correct, but is easily explained by the exceptional interest taken in this belief in Israel.

Finally, Söderblom says:[4] "Si les Juifs ont subi une influence du mazdéisme, pourquoi ne lui auraient-ils pas emprunté du moins la félicité dans la magnifique demeure du soleil, dans les lumières infinies du Très-sage Seigneur, ce qu'ils auraient pu faire d'autant plus facilement que leur propre Yahvéh demeurait au ciel parmi les lumières et qu'en effet, d'après une des nombreuses conceptions du judaïsme postérieur, il recevait les hommes pieux dans son ciel? Pourquoi partagèrent-ils leur sombre et pauvre royaume des morts, le Scheôl, en deux parties, le sein d'Abraham et le lieu des tourments?" Simply for this reason that at first—for subsequently the case was otherwise—they naturally

[1] Cp. also the passage in Herodotus, iii. 62, cited by Stave, *Einfluss*, 146 f.

[2] *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, 1898, 258 [Germ. trans., *Das rel. Leben der Juden nach dem Exil*, 1899, 257].

[3] *La vie future*, 316 ff.

[4] *Ibid.* 151.

clung as firmly as possible to their earlier views, even if it happened that they were at the same time dependent upon others. What has been so far adduced is, of course, not conclusive proof of this: but it follows again from a series of isolated details.

It is true that Böklen[1] has no justification for comparing the Persian idea, that the blessed dead would live among pleasant odours, with passages like 2 Co $2^{14ff.}$ "*Thanks be unto God, which . . . maketh manifest through us the savour of the knowledge of Christ in every place*"—or even Ph 4^{18} "*Having received from Epaphroditus the things that came from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God,*" and Eph 5^{2} "*Christ . . . gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell.*" A more relevant parallel may be found in the words in which, according to the Apocalypse of Baruch 29^{7}, God describes the delights of the future world: "*For winds will go forth from before me to bring every morning the fragrance of aromatic fruits*"—or the similar description of Paradise in the Apocalypse of Moses, §§ 29, 38, 40. On the other hand, the account given of the abode of the wicked as darkness and cold where there is wailing and chattering of teeth (Mt 8^{12} 22^{13} 25^{30}), certainly goes back to the similar description in Mazdean literature (*Yt.* 22. 25, 33, *Sacred Books*, xxiii. 319 f.): Böklen,[2] therefore, and Söderblom before him, have no right to regard the two accounts as antagonistic. But, above all, there is one idea especially important for Parsism which has in a variety of respects influenced Judaism and primitive Christianity.

As Bousset[3] has shown, the idea prevailed in Persia that the soul after death, accompanied by angels or daemons, wanders through the various heavens, and can, in fact, even before death visit these in states of ecstasy.[4] If we find a similar view among the Greeks as well, it probably springs

[1] *Verwandtschaft*, 65 f.; cp. also Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, 301 f.

[2] *Verwandtschaft*, 144, n. 1.

[3] *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1901, 155 ff.

[4] Cumont therefore is wrong when he says (*Les religions*, 309): "[La doctrine] est étrangère au zoroastrisme, et fut introduite dans les mystères mithriaques avec l'astrologie chaldéenne."

from the same source, since Plato, in whose writings it first appears, attributes it to Er, an Armenian (*Rep.* x. 614 B ff.) whom the Epicurean Colotes (see Proclus, *Comm. in Rempubl. Plat.*, ed. Kroll, ii. 109 f.) identifies with Zoroaster, and whom the Platonist Cronius describes as being at least Zoroaster's pupil. "It is significant, too, that the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Axiochus* (371) professes to report a tale told by the Magus Gobryas, a Persian authority frequently cited."[1] And even in points of detail Bousset has again shown that these Oriental views cannot in all likelihood be derived from Greek thought.

Bousset is, therefore, probably justified in his further conclusion that Paul's account of himself in 2 Co $12^{2ff.}$ as having been caught up to the third heaven, even to Paradise, is to be explained by Persian influences. That is to say, even the notion that there are three, or perhaps seven, heavens comes from Persia; and the same influences can be shown to account also for the idea that the soul withdraws from the body in conditions of ecstasy.

Further, the description of the exaltation of Jesus which we find in He 4^{14} "*He hath passed through the heavens*," and perhaps also the expression "*seen of angels*" in 1 Ti 3^{16} (possibly borrowed from an early Christian hymn), may ultimately go back to that conception. But in regard to Eph 4^{8}, where the Psalmist's words, "*He ascended on high, he led captivity captive*," are applied to Jesus, I regard it as very doubtful whether one should there think of the victory over daemons lying in wait for the soul—such daemons as Parsism probably believed in, if we are to accept the evidences collected by Böklen.[2] It is even more hazardous to posit a connexion between the Persian doctrine and the closing admonition (Eph $6^{11ff.}$): "*Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities*," etc. Again, Lk 16^{22} "*The beggar died and was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom*," has probably nothing to do with that idea: still less is Rev 14^{13} "*Their works follow with them*," dependent upon the view,

[1] Bousset, *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1901, 257.
[2] *Verwandtschaft*, 38 f.

of which there are already evidences in the Gâthas, that the righteous are accompanied by their deeds on their way to the other world. With the description of the Last Judgment, Mt $25^{31ff.}$, at which the righteous and the wicked are ignorant of what they have done, Moffatt [1] compares the extremely poetical account of the fair maiden who meets the soul of the pious man after death, and who must first introduce herself to him as his good conscience (*Yt.* 22. 9 ff., *Sacred Books*, xxiii. 315 ff.). But that is, I think, only a distant resemblance. On the other hand, the belief that Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu ultimately strive with each other for the possession of souls (*Vd.* 7. 52, 19. 28, *Sacred Books*, iv. 87, 212), has left after-effects in the reference which the Epistle of Jude (v.[9]) makes to the struggle between Michael and the devil for the body of Moses—a reference which Origen (*De Princ.* iii. 2. 1) connects with the ascension of Moses. For, if here it is his dead body, not his soul, that is concerned, still the Midrash Rabba to Dt 31^{14} runs in these terms: "*The nefarious angel Samael, the chief of all devils, waited for Moses' soul and said, When will Michael weep, and when shall I fill my mouth with laughter?*" The Epistle of Jude (or its source) would seem, therefore, only to have modified the conception.

Often there appears, besides, in Parsism a definite conductor of souls, Sraosha, Mithras, or Vohu Manô (already mentioned on p. 116), while the resurrection at the end of the days is the work of Saoshyant. But when Böklen compares with this the passage in the Psalms of Solomon $18^{6ff.}$ "*Blessed are they that shall live in those days . . . under the rod of the chastening of the Lord's anointed*," or the designation of Jesus as the author of salvation, of faith or of life, He 2^{10} 12^{2}, Ac 3^{15} 5^{31}, these refer to something entirely different—the first to the rule of the Messiah in His future kingdom, and the others to the significance of the passion and resurrection of Jesus. And still less relevant in this connexion is the saying of Jesus (Jn $14^{2f.}$), "*I go to prepare a place for you*," or the passages Lk 23^{43}, Ac 7^{56} already mentioned.

In the last place, the comparison of the resurrection

[1] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1903–4, ii. 357 f.; cp. also Mills, "Avesta Eschatology compared with the Books of Daniel and Revelation," *Monist*, 1907, 593 ff.

body with a new and heavenly garment, which we find in Enoch $62^{15f.}$, and then in 2 Co $5^{1ff.}$, Rev $3^{4f.}$ 6^{11} 7^{9} 19^{8}, is probably to be derived from the corresponding idea in Parsism [1] (*Ys.* 55. 2, *Bund.* 30. 28, *Sacred Books*, v. 127, xxxi. 294). Indeed, with reference to the argument for the resurrection which Paul in 1 Co $15^{35ff.}$ derives from the quickening of the dead grain, Böklen cites the words of Ahura Mazda (*Bund.* 30. 5, *Sacred Books*, v. 121 f.): "*When through me the sky arose from the substance of the ruby, without columns, on the spiritual support of far-compassed light; when through me the earth arose, which bore the material life, and there is no maintainer of the worldly creation but it; when by me the sun and moon and stars are conducted in the firmament of luminous bodies; when by me corn was created so that, scattered about in the earth, it grew again and returned with increase,*" etc. But, in the first place, this proof appears in the Bundahis only among several others (to which I shall not more fully refer); and, in the second place, it was really so obvious a proof that Paul could very well have employed it without any dependence—and, of course, I think only of an indirect dependence—upon that original. There remain, however, affinities sufficiently numerous to show that in certain *details* an influence has been exercised by Parsism on Judaism and primitive Christianity: no wonder, then, that it was in eschatology first that modern critics found, and doubtless exaggerated, the influence of Parsism.

c. The Moral Ideas.

(*a*) *Righteousness.*—In its reduction of the Law to the commandment of love, although this was already to be found in the Old Testament and had occasionally been called

[1] Gressmann, *Ursprung*, 346, and Bousset, *Offenbarung*, 224, believe that the white robe was originally, in the case of deities, a cultus representation of the luminous nature of their body; but whether this was really so, we need not here examine. A similar remark applies to a possible and corresponding origin for the "crown of life" in Rev 2^{10} (cp. Dieterich, *Nekyia*, 43; Volz, *Eschatologie*, 344; Gressmann, *Ursprung*, 108, n. 1; Bousset, *Offenbarung*, 209 f.). The explanation of the palms in Rev 7^{9} proposed by Deissmann [*Bibelstudien*, 1895, 285 (Eng. trans. 369 f.)], who derives them from Greek usages of worship, is rejected by Bousset (*ibid.* 284 f.), probably with justice.

the foremost commandment, Christianity is still entirely original. Further, the subordination of religious to moral duties was for Jesus a natural result of the foregoing principle, although in this tendency He may have been at the same time influenced by the Old Testament prophets. On the other hand, the legal tendency which we find in the primitive Church and also in the Gospels, and in a still harsher form in Paul's opponents, of course came simply from Judaism. Finally, the Wisdom literature has in specific points had a manifold influence upon the New Testament.

Those ideas, like this literature, hardly require in the first instance to be derived from non-Jewish religions. The subordination of religious to moral duties was, for the prophets, a result of their ethical idea of God, which had just then broken fresh upon their vision. Judaism was accordingly a compromise, such as Deuteronomy and the Book of Ezekiel had already effected, between "prophetism" and popular religion. Lastly, the Wisdom literature arose out of those experiences which every people undergoes, and which the Jewish people in particular had undergone.

In spite of this, Gunkel[1] posits in general the foreign origin of this literature, and appeals for proof in the first place to the statements of 1 K $5^{10f.\ 14}$: "*And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east, and all the wisdom of Egypt. For he was wiser than all men . . . and his fame was in all the nations round about. And there came of all peoples to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth, which had heard of his wisdom.*" "In the same way the wisdom collected in the Sapiential literature of Israel, a literary genre which made its appearance in Israel in later centuries, is clearly exotic in its origin. This is evident from the fact that almost all the great authorities to whom the sages appeal, are foreign. Thus Job and his friends, who live in the East country and in Idumaea, Agur and King Lemuel (Pr 30^1 31^1), who come from Massa in

[1] *Verständnis*, 25 f.; Hinneberg's *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, i. vii. 56; cp. also von Orelli, "Religious Wisdom as cultivated in Old Israel in common with Neighbouring Peoples," *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, 1908 i. 284 ff.

Arabia."[1] But the first of these instances finds an explanation in the general character of the Book of Job; and the cases of Agur and Lemuel are unimportant, seeing that all the preceding proverbs have been ascribed to Solomon: indeed, the passage from the Book of Kings says absolutely nothing of any foreign influences on this monarch.

However, Gunkel believes that he can find the origin of this poetry still more definitely in Egypt. This provenance is suggested by the description of behemoth and leviathan (Job $40^{15ff.}$), which, however, is no proof of the origin of the remainder—just as the dialogue form, which can be shown to have existed in Egypt, is no proof of the origin of the subject-matter. It is only if that subject-matter could really be found there that the question might be raised whether the Old Testament partially derived it from Egypt.

With reference to the words of the prophet (Hos 6^6), "*I desire mercy, and not sacrifice,* Seydel[2] has called attention, *inter alia,* to apophthegms from the Papyrus Prisse—which, however, is not so old as he supposed[3]—but without suggesting dependence. On the other hand, Révillout[4] finds in Egyptian ethics, as seen in that Papyrus, and more particularly in the Papyrus of Boulaq 4, the source of all systems of morality; and on Egyptian ethics he passes this judgment: "La morale égyptienne est souvent d'une étonnante beauté. Bien supérieure à la morale juive, elle égale parfois la morale chrétienne." Amélineau[5] modifies these statements seriously, though even he admits that many sayings, particularly in the Papyrus of Boulaq, remind us of the Sermon on the Mount; thus, *e.g.* the saying: "*Ce que déteste le sanctuaire de Dieu, ce sont les fêtes bruyantes; si tu l'implores avec un coeur aimant dont toutes les paroles sont mystérieuses, il entend les paroles, il accepte tes offrandes.*" But he does not suggest indebtedness, and indebtedness is, of course, far from being established[6] by the one parallel from that Papyrus, which Gunkel puts along-

[1] Cp. also Wildeboer, *Die Sprüche,* 1897, 89.

[2] *Evangelium,* 202.

[3] Cp. Amélineau, *La morale égyptienne quinze siècles avant notre ère,* 1892, xi.; Jéquier, *Le papyrus Prisse et ses variantes,* 1911.

[4] *La morale égyptienne,* 1889, 1 ff., 15.

[5] *Morale,* xxiii. ff.

[6] Cp., further, p. 33 above.

side of the warning, so universally needed, against the strange woman (Pr 2^{16} 6^{24} 7^{5} 23^{27}).

In addition, Gunkel appears to regard Babylonian influences as possible, although the "Assyrian riddles and proverbs" which he compares, and which Jäger[1] has collected, are only externally similar. Zimmern,[2] on the other hand, strongly emphasizes the disparity which exists in particular between prophetic and Babylonian ethics; and so by anticipation he reduces to their right measure Delitzsch's[3] assertions on the opposite side. Most recently of all Diettrich[4] has shown that "the 'theoretical wisdom'[5] . . . so far from being borrowed from abroad, has, on the contrary, made a way for itself, and perhaps also for its most notable discoveries . . . in violent conflict with a foreign theology and ethic, perhaps the Babylonian, at any rate the theology and ethic that prevailed in the ancient East."

Persian influences are perhaps admitted by Cheyne,[6] when, for example, he compares with Ps 50^{14} "*Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving, so shalt thou pay thy vows unto the Most High,*" the passage in *Ys.* 33. 14 (*Sacred Books*, xxxi. 79): "*Thus, as an offering, Zarathustra gives the life of his very body. And he offers, likewise, O Mazda! the priority of the Good Mind* (*his eminence gained*) *by his holiness* (*with Thy folk*); *and he offers* (*above all his*) *Obedience* (*to Thee*) *in deed and in speech, and with these* (*Thine established*) *Sovereign Power.*" Also Moffatt[7] quotes as a parallel to the commendation of charity in To $4^{7ff.}$, Slav. Enoch 9, Mt 25^{40}—he might, of course, have multiplied these references—a passage from *Yt.* 24. 36 (*Sacred Books*, xxiii. 337): "*Thou art entreated* (*for charity*) *by the whole of the living world, and she* (i.e. *the law*) *is ever standing at thy door in the person of thy brethren in the faith*" (cp. *Vd.* 3. 35, 18. 33 f., 19. 29, *Sacred Books*, iv. 31, 196, 212 f.). But in point of fact such precepts in the

[1] *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, 1894, 274 ff.

[2] *Keilinschriften*, 612 f. [3] *Babel u. Bibel*, iii., 1905, 21 ff.

[4] "Die theoret. Weisheit der Einleitung zum Buch der Sprüche, ihr spezifischer Inhalt u. ihre Entstehung," *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1908, 500 ff.

[5] [This expression apparently means "the speculative element in the Sapiential books."—Tr.]

[6] *Origin*, 396 ff. [7] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1903–4, ii. 358.

Avesta recede into insignificance behind those of the ceremonial law. "Parmi les quatre péchés les plus graves, qui rendent enceinte la Druj, démon féminin du mensonge" . . . Söderblom[1] most justly remarks, "nous trouvons les trois transgressions suivantes, qui sont ainsi mises sur la même ligne par le mazdéisme: refuser au pauvre la moindre partie des biens amassés; uriner sur son pied; ne pas porter la ceinture et la chemise sacrées après avoir atteint l'âge de quinze ans. Le dernier péché, qui est directement religieux et ne concerne pas la pureté, ni les relations avec le prochain, est même considéré comme le plus grave. Lui seul ne peut pas être expié" (*Vd.* 18. 30 ff., *Sacred Books*, vi. 196 ff.). Would not this perhaps explain in part the declension of the Jewish faith into mere legalism? On the other hand, this declension is doubtless connected, as E. Meyer[2] shows, with that emphasis on ritual which, again, in all religions followed upon the assimilation of the gods to one another. There is the further circumstance, which Bousset[3] notes, that the enormous importance attached to ceremonial precepts as compared with the requirements of the cult has its parallel in Parsism, and above all is not sufficiently explained by the development of Judaism itself. For it is hardly enough to say that in the period before and during the Maccabaean struggles the ruling priestly caste once and for all forfeited the confidence of the people, and that the nation always spread itself more and more widely in the Diaspora, in which it was impossible to offer sacrifices:[4] a part has been played also by other influences, which continued to operate in Mandaeism.[5] But in this matter we are dealing with a tendency which more than any other is assailed in the New Testament, and therefore hardly falls to be considered here.

On the other hand, the New Testament itself, like Jewish thought before it, compares righteousness with light, and sin with darkness. That, however, goes directly back to Parsism: for the analogy appears first of all, as Bousset[6] points out, and

[1] *La vie future*, 114. [2] *Geschichte des Altertums*, iii. 172 f.
[3] *Das Wesen der Religion*, 1903, 140 ff.
[4] Cp. Bousset, *Religion*, 130 ff.
[5] Cp. Brandt, *Mand. Religion*, 173. [6] *Religion*, 587.

as we have already seen (p. 115 f.), in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, along with the dualism which we were constrained to derive from the same source. And this leads us to the other group of ethical ideas which some would trace to other religions.

(β) *Sin.*—The New Testament at large presupposes the universality of sin. In the case of Jesus' teaching, this is obvious from the fact that He begins His ministry with the call to repentance (Mk 1^{15}, Mt 4^{17}), and bids His disciples pray for the forgiveness of their sins (Mt 6^{12}, Lk 11^{4}); further, He plainly describes men as evil (Mt 7^{11}, Lk 11^{13}). And in the same way Paul says in Ro 3^{23} "*All have sinned*"; and the Epistle of James 3^{2} "*In many things we all stumble.*" We find this view also in Jewish thought; it is equally manifest in the prophets; and as early as Gn 8^{21} there are the words, "*The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.*"[1]

These statements are certainly in no need of being explained by foreign influences: in fact, if one compares the so-called penitential psalms of the Babylonians, the question which Zimmern describes as an open one, viz. "how far the similar mode of expression among Babylonians and Hebrews warrants the inference of a similar mode of religious thought and feeling, or how far it is only a matter of outward and formal agreement," is probably, in view of what has been already remarked, to be answered in the latter sense. Besides, the consciousness of sin which we find in Parsism, and which in turn lived on in Mandaeism, was of an essentially different nature from the Judaeo-Christian.

We have already seen (p. 62 f.) that the problem of the origin of sin was raised, and that its origin was found to lie in the flesh.[2] Alongside of this, however, there appears in the writings of Paul (1 Co 15^{21}, Ro 5^{12}) and in Jn 8^{44} another theory, which traces sin to the fall of Adam—in what way, we need not at present further inquire. This

[1] Cp. the short account in Clemen, *Sünde*, i. 100 ff.; also Brückner, *Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie*, 1903, 86 ff.

[2] The anthropological dualism which Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, 361 ff., would derive from the East, is of a different nature.

theory also exists already in Jewish thought, first of all in Sirach, where in 25^{24} there is this statement, "*From a woman was the beginning of sin; and because of her we all die*"—and still more clearly in Wisdom, the Apocalypses of Moses and Baruch, and 2 Esdras.[1] On the other hand, Gn 3 is not originally intended to describe the origin of sin, but, as Gunkel[2] says, to explain the weal and woe of human life—man's most distinctive possession, reason, and his pitiful lot, the toils of husbandry and the travail of birth. So far, however, as the narrative has been understood at a later time in the manner indicated, we must raise the question whether it may come from a foreign source.

In proof of such an origin it might be urged that the Garden of Eden, according to Gn 2^{8}, lies in the East, and that the description in v.$^{10ff.}$ points to the same quarter: but these verses are probably supplementary to the original tradition, and the other statement proves nothing for the source of the history of the Fall, with which alone we are here concerned. The same may be said of the manifold parallels to the other features in the account. Of these parallels the most complete collection has been made by Tennant,[3] who at the same time justly rejects many proposed identifications, *e.g.* that which Zimmern[4] has suggested between the serpent and Tiâmat. But even the Adapa-myth already mentioned (p. 153 f.), which Zimmern compares with the story of the Fall itself, is in reality, as Gunkel[5] holds, a narrative akin in details but otherwise entirely different: its hero, who, as we saw, is not necessarily the Primal Man, loses the chance of immortality by refusing in heaven the bread and water of life that are offered to him. Still less comparable is the Etana-myth, the hero of which would mount to heaven on an eagle, but when near his goal is smitten with terror and falls down headlong. And since the description at the end of the third tablet of the Babylonian Creation-Epic[6] has no connexion with the Fall—although it was at one time often interpreted in that

[1] Cp., finally, Bousset, *Religion*, 467 ff. [2] *Genesis*, 24.
[3] *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*, 32 ff.
[4] *Keilinschriften*, 529. [5] *Genesis*, 33.
[6] Cp. Jensen, *Mythen*, 20 f.; also Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 494.

way—there remains, finally, nothing but the well-known representation on a cylinder-seal (Fig. 8). On this Jeremias [1] pronounces the following opinion: "The tree with its two *poma* is certainly the tree of life. But the two seated and clothed figures are not reaching to take the fruit. One of them wears the horned head-dress exclusively used for the gods. The line behind the figure sitting on the left is obviously a serpent: but its position does not correspond with the place it would hold in a drawing of the Fall." And Tennant [2] says: "It may be safely concluded, then, that we possess no Babylonian parallel to the Hebrew Fall-story." Further, when Delitzsch [3] postulates such a parallel to account for the Babylonian consciousness of sin, the argument is unconvincing: in Israel, for many generations at all events, no theory of the origin of sin was ever put forth. Of course, there *may* have been such a parallel in existence among the Babylonians: but we cannot yet produce evidence of it.

On the other hand, Cumont [4] directs attention to several Mithraic monuments which remind us of the story of the Fall. "Audessus du Mithra πετρογενής, se dresse sur le bas-relief d'Osterburken (Fig. 9) un arbre semblable à un figuier, dont la ramure s'étend jusqu'au sommet de la pierre. Devant cet arbre, se tient un jeune homme, qui dépouille à l'aide d'un coutelas une branche des larges feuilles et des fruits oblongs qui la garnissent. Un personnage semblable mais dont la poitrine est couverte d'une tunique orientale, sort de la frondaison, dont son buste émerge seul, et un dieu barbu du Vent, placé dans le coin de la plaque, souffle avec violence vers lui. La comparaison de ce groupe avec le bas-relief de Neuenheim montre que l'artiste a combiné ici deux scènes, ou plutôt représenté simultanément deux moments successifs d'une même action. L'adolescent nu effeuillant un rameau, est placé ici devant une des quatre figures des Vents, tandis que devant une autre, le dieu vêtu caché dans le feuillage lui fait pendant. Les deux scènes sont aussi séparées sur le bas-

[1] *Das A.T.* 203 [Eng. trans. i. 220]; cp. also König, *Bibel u. Babel*, 26 ff.

[2] *The Sources*, 49. Nor is this result altered by the further discussion on p. 346 f.

[3] *Wo lag das Paradies?* 1881, 45.

[4] *Textes*, i. 163 f.; cp. 194.

relief de Heddernheim, où le costume oriental du dieu enfoncé dans l'arbre est plus distinct que partout ailleurs, et sans doute aussi sur le marbre de Mauls, où tous les détails sont devenus méconnaissables." It does not seem to me indubitable that all these representations actually refer to the same subject: but even if that were the case, the resemblance to the story of the Fall would be very slight. Further, Cumont himself admits that nothing corresponding can be shown to have existed in the religion of ancient Persia; and even then it could not have influenced the story of the Fall, which is found already in the Jahwistic document.

However that may be, the particular tradition to be found in *Yt.* 19. 34 (*Sacred Books*, xxiii. 293 f.), that Yima owing to his fall was deprived of the divine Glory which till then clave unto him, may, as Bousset[1] remarks, have evoked the corresponding idea in Jewish thought regarding the effect of Adam's fall. And to that idea Paul in turn is indebted when he says in Ro 3^{23} "*All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God.*" But this is, of course, like the point mentioned at the end of the preceding section, merely a detail; apart from it, there is no evidence of a foreign influence on those ethical views of genuine primitive Christianity that are derived from Judaism.

2. The New Ideas of Christianity.

a. The Person of Christ.

The New Testament everywhere presupposes the historicity of the crucifixion of Jesus, although, generally speaking, it is only the Gospels that give any definite details of that event. Hardly any one would be disposed to regard the whole of it as mythical: but it would still be possible that individual features had a legendary character. We shall therefore not be relieved of the task of examining even the more sweeping assertions of certain English scholars.

Their views are thus summarized by Goblet d'Alviella:[2]

[1] *Religion*, 557; *Hauptprobleme*, 199.
[2] *Rev. de l'hist. des rel.*, 1904, xlix. 69.

"Déjà M. Frazer sans contester le fond historique de l'Évangile, avait laissé entendre que les détails, sinon le fait de la crucifixion, pouvaient avoir été suggérés par un rite analogue à la cérémonie des Sacées, où les Babyloniens pendaient ou crucifiaient un criminel, qu'ils avaient commencé par revêtir d'ornements royaux et par traiter en roi durant trois journées.[1] Jevons allait plus loin, en supposant que toute l'histoire du Christ était une explication du traitement infligé à un dieu du blé et du vin, qu'on mettait à mort pour mieux le faire renaître. William Simpson, de son côté, voyait dans la passion et la resurrection du Christ un vieux rite d'initiation, où l'on feignait d'immoler le néophyte, afin de le ressusciter à une vie nouvelle. Voici M. John Robertson qui prétend découvrir dans Jésus le héros d'un mystère juif, où l'on représentait le fils d'un dieu sacrifié par son père pour le salut des hommes et où les assistants mangeaient la victime pour s'assimiler sa substance; ce qui permet d'identifier à la passion du Christ les aventures des dieux païens mourant pour renaître: Osiris, Tammouz, Adonis, Attis, Dionysos, Héraklès, sans compter les millions de victimes humaines qui ont été partout sacrifiées pour assurer par un processus magique le salut des survivants."

Robertson[2] takes as his starting-point the human sacrifice that prevailed among the Khonds in India till fifty or sixty years ago. First the victim was garlanded with flowers and worshipped; then he was wedged into the trunk of a tree in such a way that he and it together formed a cross; that he might be incapable of resistance, his arms and legs (or only the latter) were broken, and he was drugged with opium or datura; finally, he was put to death. With this Robertson compares the narrative of the death of Jesus, chiefly for the reason that according to Mk 15^{23} Jesus also was offered a stupefying draught, while in Jn $19^{33ff.}$ there is the explicit statement that His legs were *not* broken, "*that the scripture*"

[1] In regard to similar theories advanced by others, cp. the exhaustive account in Reinach, "Le roi supplicié," *L'Anthropologie*, 1902, 620 ff. = *Cultes, mythes et religions*, i., 1905, 332 ff.

[2] *Pagan Christs*, [2]1911, 108 ff.

(Ex 12^{46}, Nu 9^{12}) "*might be fulfilled, A bone of him* [*the Passover lamb*] *shall not be broken.*" But even this circumstance Robertson can explain in harmony with his initial assumption. The Passover, he says, was originally a sacrifice of firstlings, including the first-born sons; when a lamb was substituted for the child, the custom of breaking the victim's bones was abandoned in order to efface every recollection of a human sacrifice. However, the injunction with which we are dealing can be much more simply explained in another way;[1] and the administration of a narcotic to the culprit was in accordance with Jewish practice (*Sanhedr.* 43a). Thus of the similarity between the human sacrifices in India and the Passover, only this feature is left, that for the Passover lamb, as Jeremias[2] also remarks, the mode of transfixion, according to Justin (*Dial.* 40. 259 B), was cruciform: but obviously this proves nothing. And the crucifixion of Jesus could only be explained by the Indian practice if other details in the account pointed to it. Robertson argues from Jesus' intercourse with publicans and sinners and His relation to Mary Magdalene (who, he says, was subsequently regarded as a harlot), and he daringly explains these circumstances by the fact that among the tribes of the Kotaya-hill the victim had previously all the women of the village placed at his disposal. He further regards it as possible that the one year which formed the period of Jesus' active ministry, and his entry into Jerusalem, may be traced to the same prototype, in which one must, of course, first insert the corresponding features. Of the simultaneous execution of two others, Robertson himself says only that in view of the Gospel narrative one must assume that they also were an element in the Indian custom: the reference to the practice that obtained at Bundair in Jeypore, viz. of offering three victims at one time to the Sun-god, is apparently regarded as an inadequate explanation. Nor is there any demonstrative force in what Winckler[3] and Jeremias adduce in proof of such

[1] Cp. (Knobel-) Dillmann, *Die Bücher Exodus u. Leviticus*, 1880, 106; Holzinger, *Exodus*, 1900, 40.

[2] *Babylonisches*, 22, n. 2.

[3] *Geschichte Israels*, ii. 229, n. 4, *Forschungen*, iii. 33 f., 49 f.; Paton, "Die

a custom; and as an argument against the historicity of the Christian tradition it is not possible to urge, with Fiebig,[1] "that these two malefactors, even where they are differently characterized according to their relation to Jesus, give an artificial and schematic impression"—for why should the Evangelists describe them more closely? Besides, when Robertson explains that alleged practice by saying that formerly a king's son was sacrificed, but that latterly, when malefactors were substituted, one of them was made to appear as a king by having two others in their real character put by his side—this theory, which is far from probable in itself, has this at least against it, that the assumption involved does not admit of proof. But Robertson even supposes that the sacrifice was originally that of a god, and that this explains the name *Ἰησοῦς Βαραββᾶς*, which some manuscripts known to Origen read in Mt 27[16f.] as the name borne by the other victim whom Pilate presented before the people. For Jesus, he says, was originally a god: witness first of all the Old Testament Joshua, of whom the same statement is true; in the second place, the Jesus of the Apocalypse and the Didache, which are pre-Christian; finally, the description of Joshua as "the Prince of the Presence" in the Jewish liturgy for the ecclesiastical New Year. It is easy to see that all this must be differently estimated: still, Robertson operates here, at any rate, with conceptions that might actually, had they been present, have influenced Christianity. But do even the first-mentioned of these ideas, which certainly show only a slight resemblance to the story of Jesus' Passion, give any indication of their presence in the *milieu* of the New Testament?

Robertson proves merely that even so late in history human sacrifices were occasionally offered: but these have few affinities or none with the story of the Passion. It is

Kreuzigung Jesu," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1901, 339 f., says only: "Threefold crucifixion must have a ritual significance; for on the one hand crucifixion on three crosses was the Persian mode of putting a usurper to death (?), on the other hand the triad, or a multiple of it, is frequently found in the ancient world in connexion with the sacrifices of human beings or of kings."

[1] *Babel*, 8 f.

true that Porphyrius (*De Abstin.* ii. 54) says with regard to the malefactor sacrificed every year in Rhodes to the god Kronos, that previously he was given wine to drink. Robertson [1] remarks on this: "Here we have at length a close parallel in the Mediterranean world to what we have seen reason to regard as a typical detail in the gospel mystery-play" — but the resemblance is surely unimportant. The evidence from the Sacaea is more plausible: granted, however, that the Sacaea may have influenced the behaviour of the Roman soldiers (although the death of Jesus is alleged to have taken place at quite a different season), we have still no ground to presuppose for Judaism, at least, the existence of this or a similar festival that might have given rise to a fictitious narrative of the Crucifixion. For we have already seen that this story had no connexion with the Passover; and it had still less with the execution (at Antony's order) of Antigonus, the last of the Hasmonaeans (Jos. *BJ* i. 18. 3, *Ant.* xiv. 16. 4, xv. 1. 2); and what Philo tells us (*In Flacc.* 5 f., ed. Mangey, ii. 521 f.) of a certain Carabas in Alexandria, who was apparelled and reverenced like a king, in order to burlesque Agrippa, is perhaps equally irrelevant. Further, the dramatic character of the story of the Passion does not necessarily prove that it was originally designed as a mystery-play: in essentials it is certainly historical.

The same criticism applies to the attempt which Butler [2] makes to derive from the Eleusinian Mysteries not only the narrative of the Passion, but also the supposition in the Synoptists' account that Jesus' public activity lasted for one year. This supposition, he says, is to be traced to the fact that a full year had to elapse between initiation into the Lesser Mysteries, to which the baptism of Jesus corresponded, and admission to the Greater. The procession from Athens to Eleusis, which was customary at the Greater Mysteries, accordingly reappears in Jesus' entry into Jerusalem; also the bearing of a κέρνος by the mystae (?) reappears in the prohibition (!) which Jesus issued (Mk 11^{16}), that no one

[1] *Pagan Christs*, 137.

[2] "The Greek Mysteries and the Gospel Narrative," *Nineteenth Century*, 1905, lvii. 490 ff.

should carry a vessel through the temple. "The third day of the mysteries was in an especial degree a fast-day, and the fourth day seems to have been known as the καλάθου κάθοδος, the 'return journey of the fruit-basket.' Matthew (21[18. 19]) tells us: 'In the morning as he returned to the city he hungered, and seeing a fig-tree by the wayside he came to it . . . and he saith unto it: Let there be no fruit from thee henceforward for ever.' At Athens there was a sacred fig-tree at which one of the processions always halted to offer sacrifices and perform certain mystic rites.—Purification was another essential ceremony of the mysteries. So in John (13[4-11]) we read of the washing of the disciples' feet, with the words, 'He who has been bathed has no need to wash, but is wholly purified.' No mention of this washing of the disciples' feet occurs in any of the other Gospels, but in Mark and Luke there is the man 'bearing a pitcher of water.'" [1] Of the explanation of the Lord's Supper we shall hear at a later point: then the jesting which was indulged in at the Eleusinian and other Mysteries, and prior to which "the mystes had been crowned with a myrtle wreath, a fawn-skin had been put over his shoulders and a wand placed in his hand," [2] is compared with the mocking of Jesus by the soldiers and the people. Again, the formula with which the celebration of the Mysteries ended, is supposed to echo in the τετέλεσται of Jn 19[30], and the delivery of a memento of the Mysteries, which was generally preserved in a linen cloth, has its counterpart—in the burial of Jesus in the μνημεῖον, Mk 15[45]. Finally, the resurrection on the third day is to be derived from the celebration of the Epidauria on the eighth. Here, too, the resemblance is far from striking: but, more than this, the Gospel tradition cannot be shown to be so absolutely unhistorical as Butler declares.

Or does the particular tradition which is maintained by Paul (1 Co 5[7] 15[4]), the Evangelists, and certainly also the other New Testament writers, viz. that Jesus died at the time

[1] "The Greek Mysteries and the Gospel Narrative," *Nineteenth Century*, 1905, lvii. 492.

[2] *Ibid.* 495.

of a Passover and arose from the dead on the third day,[1] perhaps spring from another religion?

Dupuis[2] in his time explained the statements by the circumstance that after the vernal equinox the sun again triumphs over darkness; and more recently Zimmern[3] and Jensen[4] have pointed to the festival in honour of Marduk's resurrection, which is celebrated at the same season. In particular, Zimmern understands the three days as the time during which the moon is obscured before its reappearance in the spring, on which account also in the cult of Adonis the return of the god was celebrated after three days. O. Pfleiderer[5] refers to the similar usages in the cults of Attis and Osiris (Plut. *De Is.* 13. 39; Ps. Luc. *De Dea Syr.* 6), while A. Meyer[6] would at all events explain the three days differently. He calls attention not only to the passage in Ps 16[10] "*Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol; neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption,*" but also to the Persian idea that after death the soul remains first of all for three days in the neighbourhood of the body—a conception which Böklen,[7] Bousset,[8] and Moffatt[9] also compare. Cheyne[10] and Brückner[11] refer only generally to the pagan myths regarding the death and reawaking of a divinity; and the whole question is most fully treated by Gunkel[12] and Fiebig.[13]

The former, in the first instance, refers merely in general terms to these myths, but afterwards he says more

[1] Littmann in his article "Three and a Fraction," *Monist*, 1906, 630, asks: "When Paul says 'on the third day', who knows whether he did not exactly mean Tuesday, for in the Eastern languages of to-day, Tuesday is called 'Third-day'?" But it is to be hoped that this is not intended seriously.

[2] *Origine*, iii. 55 ff.

[3] *Keilinschriften*, 362, 366, 370 f., 387, 388 f., 500.

[4] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 925.

[5] *Christusbild*, 62 f., 69, n. 1, 105 [Eng. trans. 93 ff., 103 n., 155]; *Religion u. Religionen*, 1906, 221 ff.

[6] *Die Auferstehung Christi*, 1905, 182 ff. Pp. 11 and 297 in the same work and p. 39 in *Wer hat das Christentum begründet, Jesus oder Paulus?* (1907) are probably to be understood in the light of this passage.

[7] *Verwandtschaft*, 29.

[8] *Religion*, 341, n. 1.

[9] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1902–3, i. 777.

[10] *Bible Problems*, 119 f.

[11] *Gottheiland*, 35 ff.

[12] *Verständnis*, 76 ff.

[13] *Babel*, 4 ff.

definitely: "Is it a casual occurrence that Jesus should be alleged to have risen from the dead on *this* day in the calendar, on this most sacred Sunday, when the sun rises from the night of winter? Ought we not to suppose that the idea of the rising again of the dead god had for a long time marked this day for its own? The coincidence of the Christian date with what is certainly the resurrection-day of ancient Oriental belief, is so striking that one seems forced to the conclusion that some borrowing has taken place. If, however, the *date* of the resurrection has been appropriated from abroad, so also has the *idea* of the resurrection." Further, he remarks that the time variously denominated "on the third day" and "after three days," to which, in his opinion, the tradition attaches such importance, cannot be derived from the Old Testament, and that only the former specification agrees with the chronology of the Gospel narrative; the other must therefore have been accepted as a dogma by the early Church, and can only be explained by the influence of a foreign religion. Three, he maintains, is a variant of three and a half: the significance of this latter number has been discussed on an earlier page (p. 142).[1]

Here Jeremias[2] also agrees with Gunkel, though elsewhere,[3] apparently without observing the inconsistency, he explains the three days in Zimmern's fashion.

Last of all, Fiebig regards Gunkel's arguments as hardly conclusive, but thinks that he can supplement them by some others. I shall state these and append my own criticism.

Fiebig says: "The obscuration of the sun at the time of Jesus' death is certainly mythical. Now one may observe in the Talmud that when Rabbis die, there are reports of miracles, which always vary according to the characteristics and importance of the particular Rabbi. If, then, at Jesus' death we hear of the sun being darkened, that would imply a comparison of Jesus with the sun." This reasoning I utterly fail to comprehend.

When, further, Jeremias is quoted, who (like others)

[1] Cp. also Gunkel's previous work, *Schöpfung*, 268, n. 1.
[2] *Babylonisches*, 43.
[3] *Das A.T.* 600 [Eng. trans. ii. 307].

explains the mocking of Jesus, and His crucifixion between two murderers, by the usages observed at the Sacaean festival, it must be remembered that this scholar does not necessarily regard these features as unhistorical. But even if one had to suppose them so, it would not affect the historicity of the resurrection, for there is no evidence to connect the *resurrection* with the Sacaea. On what principle, then, can Fiebig maintain that the belief in Jesus' resurrection has arisen from the transference of the Sacaean myth to Him?

And still weaker is his last argument: "Add to this, that in the reports of the resurrection the angelophanies are undoubtedly of a mythical character, and we have finally the impression that that age, even in Palestine, must have been steeped in the notions of Oriental mythology, and that these had a formative influence on the story of Jesus." This is again a hasty conclusion: it is impossible to deduce from the angelophanies the unhistorical nature of the whole tradition.

Further difficulties emerge. Zimmern, Gunkel, A. Meyer,[1] and Fiebig suppose that such a myth influenced Christianity not directly, but through the medium of Judaism, although, as we have already seen, there is no trace of this to be discovered in Judaism. Or can it be shown, as Fiebig maintains, "that such traditions must have existed"? He says: "One has only to realize the following facts: in Babylon the Babylonian New-Year in the month Nisan, the festival of the resurrection of Marduk, was one of the chief festivals, and was therefore definitely fixed in the popular mind. It is notorious that the Jews have remodelled their idea of the Messiah after Babylonian patterns, as the Apocalypse shows. What possible ground is there for

[1] At any rate he expresses himself thus in *Wer hat das Christentum begründet?* 39 f., whereas in *Auferstehung*, 182 ff., there is no mention of this idea, and on p. 12 he only says: "The Christian Churches were formed of coteries of Jews who did not come straight from the correct school of sober-minded Rabbis, and had not received a Sadducean training in the virtues of good breeding." But subsequently he proceeds: "What a profusion of popular notions was now certain to stream in with all the Samaritans, Syrians, natives of Asia Minor, Greeks, Egyptians, Roman slaves and soldiers, who afterwards became Christians."

denying that they also declared of their Messiah that he would rise on the third day?" Another specimen of inexact reasoning! In the first place, it is, as we have shown above (p. 145), by no means proved that the Jews remodelled their idea of the Messiah after Babylonian patterns. But even if it were so, was the festival of Marduk's rising actually a resurrection-festival? In regard to this Zimmern[1] says: "I am not yet quite certain whether *tabû*, rising, is to be explained (as Jensen[2] holds) in the sense of 'epiphany' or simply in the sense of *aṣû*, יצא, 'removal,' as elsewhere one speaks of the *aṣû* of Marduk at this festival." And although he proceeds thus: "At all events . . . it must be true also of Marduk, as the sun-god, that he dies in winter and descends into the underworld, from which he again rises at the beginning of spring," yet this is nowhere said to take place after three days. In fact, there is no evidence at all in Babylonian records for such a specification of date—it is only postulated because it is supposed that the disappearance of the moon for three days became a motif in mythology. But how in that case can it be maintained that, since Babylonia had given the Jews a prototype for their Messiah, they are bound to have declared that he would rise on the third day or after three days?[3]

Still, it is possible that another cult, in which the resurrection of the god was actually celebrated on the third day or after three days, may have influenced Judaism. Only, we must remark that this possibility cannot be converted into a probability.

Nor is Gunkel[4] more fortunate when he would connect the three days with the number "three and a half," of which we have already heard. Seventy-two, for all we know, may have an older history than seventy; and it is not proved that the number three has anywhere taken the place of the

[1] *Keilinschriften*, 371. [2] Cp. also *Gilgameschepos*, i. 925.

[3] The festival of Marduk was celebrated on the *first days* of Nisan, whereas the death of Jesus is assigned to the 14th or 15th: and this circumstance might be explained by saying that the Passover was observed then: but that was obviously no conclusive reason why the death of Jesus should be represented as taking place also on this day.

[4] Similarly also Carus, in the *Monist*, 1906, 419.

unlucky three-and-a-half. It is only of the reverse operation that instances are found: in Lk 4^{25} and Ja 5^{17} the drought in the days of Elijah lasts three years and six months, in 1 K 18^{1} only three years. And it would need first to be demonstrated that a return of the Messiah was expected at all.

Gunkel, however, thinks that he can infer even this from the circumstance "that Jesus should be said to have risen from the dead on *this* day in the calendar, on this most sacred Sunday, when the sun arises from the night of winter." Here we have, of course, two assumptions: the first, that the Sunday was already observed by the Jews; and the second, that the Sunday after the Passover had some particular significance. It is only the former of these that Gunkel [1] has attempted to prove, with what success we must now discover.

He remarks first of all that the observance of Sunday in the Christian Church was very early vindicated on this ground "among others," that Jesus arose from the dead on that day —and in point of fact we read in Ep. Barn. 15^{9} "*For this reason we also celebrate with gladness the first day, on which* ALSO *Jesus rose from the dead, and having manifested himself ascended to heaven.*" And van den Bergh van Eysinga [2] says with reference to this passage: "The closing part of Barnabas (chap. 15) does not explain how the observance of Sunday arose, but at the most points to a circumstance connected with Sunday which might make a custom already in existence more acceptable to primitive Christians." But the real meaning of this *καί* may be discovered in the preceding context. The writer of the Epistle has combined Ex 20^{8} and Ps 24^{4} in one precept: "*Keep the Sabbath of the Lord holy with clean hands and a pure heart*," and has shown that the Jews could not do this; then he cites Is 1^{13} "*Your new moons and Sabbaths I cannot away with*," and he remarks: "*Observe what he means by this: not your present Sabbaths are acceptable to me, but that which I have appointed and on which I shall make all things rest, in order then to bring about*

[1] *Verständnis*, 73 ff.

[2] "De breking des broods," *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1905, 267.

the beginning of the eighth day, i.e. *to open a new era.*" Thus the author, I admit, adduces another reason than the resurrection for the observance of Sunday: but he does not describe the observance as pre-Christian. Nor can it be inferred from the passage in Slavonic Enoch 32[2ff.] "*And I blessed the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, for in it I rested from all my labours. Then also I established the eighth day. Let the eighth be the first after my work, and let the days be after the fashion of seven thousand. Let there be at the beginning of the eighth thousand a time when there is no computation, and no end; neither years nor months, nor weeks nor days, nor hours.*" For here it is not an ordinary day that is spoken of: the passage implies such a speculation as we have just found in the Epistle of Barnabas, and so can prove nothing. Among the Essenes we hear only (Jos. *BJ* ii. 8. 5) of an observance of solar times, but not of an observance of Sunday in addition to that of the Sabbath (*ibid.* 9). And if the Therapeutae (Philo, *De Vita Cont.* 8, ed. Mangey, ii. 481)[1] observed the fiftieth day, that day was not the seventh Sunday: to maintain that they celebrated Sunday in any way is to imply the spuriousness of the work just named: if it is spurious, *i.e.* Christian, there is nothing proved with regard to *Judaism.*

Indeed we are not even able to point to another religion from which Judaism could have borrowed the observance of Sunday. It does not seem to be an early feature in Mandaeism: it is described as a Christian custom, and appears as a Mandaean practice only in the latest portions of the Ginzâ.[2] In Mithraism also the observance of the *dies solis* is perhaps too late to have had any influence on Judaism:[3] and

[1] On the question of the date, cp. Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 535 [Eng. trans. II. iii. 358].

[2] Cp. Brandt, *Mand. Rel.* 90, 141, 204, also as against Brückner, *Gottheiland*, 42.

[3] Carus deals very arbitrarily with the question when he writes thus in the *Monist* for 1906, 420: "Sunday was then the great festive day of the Mithraists, and the disciples of St. John as well as the Nazarenes celebrated the day by coming together and breaking bread in a common meal. . . . That Sunday was celebrated prior to Christianity is unquestionably proved by the fact that St. Paul visits in the several cities those circles of 'disciples' who had neither heard of the Holy Ghost, nor believed as yet on Christ Jesus, and they used to break bread in common on the first day of the week."

there is still less to be said for the extraordinary view of Gunkel, who without more ado derives the observance of the Christian Sunday—a name which first occurs in Justin! —from some religion of sun-worshippers. Again, what is proved by the argument that according to Ro 14^5 definite fast-days were observed in the Christian community, and that in later times pagan festivals gained a standing in the Church? For the passage in the Epistle to the Romans refers to Jewish customs, and, as Gunkel himself admits, the other statement applies only to a later period.

Even if we admit, what is by no means admissible, that in some circles or other within Judaism the Sunday was already observed, is there anything to indicate that particular sanctity was attached to the Sunday following the Passover? Gunkel simply takes this for granted, but only because, in a momentary forgetfulness, he fails to notice what was the fixed time for the observance of the Passover. It was not the time of the vernal equinox—otherwise one could have attributed to the following Sunday a particular significance (if there was any celebration of Sunday at that time)—but the first full moon after the equinox:[1] so there was hardly a reason for observing the following Sunday in any special fashion.

The theory of Zimmern, Gunkel, A. Meyer, and Fiebig is, however, correct to the following extent. As we have again seen just now, they make Judaism the medium of the influence which other religions are supposed to have exercised on the tradition of the death and resurrection of Jesus. The idea that these religions could have had a direct influence, that the festivals (say) in the cult of Attis and of Osiris could without any intermediary have produced the tradition of the death and resurrection of Jesus, whether at this definite time or at any time, is absolutely inconceivable, in view of

[1] With Schürer, *Geschichte*, i., 1901, 749 ff. [Eng. trans. I. ii. 372 ff.], I suppose that the Jewish calendar was not fixed before the fourth century; but even if this fixation (as again Schwartz lately maintains in an article entitled "Osterbetrachtungen," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1906, 6 ff.) had taken place earlier and as early as the Judaic period, this would make no difference for our question: it was the Christians of Cappadocia who first made the vernal equinox the date of Easter.

the antiquity of the tradition. It is, however, possible that the reckoning "after three days" goes back to the Persian conception already spoken of, which we also find in Jewish thought, and which must certainly be adduced to explain one New Testament passage: for in Jn $11^{6.\ 39}$ the account runs that Lazarus was raised on the fourth day after his death, that is, when the soul had certainly forsaken his body. Indeed, one might urge, as another proof of such dependence, that like the resurrection of Jesus in Mk 16^{2} and par., the final separation of soul and body in *Yt.* 22. 7 (*Sacred Books*, xxiii. 315) and *Vd.* 19. 28 (*ibid.* iv. 212), takes place at daybreak. But, strictly speaking, it is in Matthew that this circumstance is first mentioned; and, what is more important, in the New Testament it is the third day after death that is spoken of, in Persian literature it is the fourth. One might at the most explain in this way the phrase "after three days," which in other passages serves to define the time of Jesus' resurrection; but even then, only if no other and no more obvious explanation is to be found. And in point of fact there is such an explanation for this as for the rest of the tradition regarding the death and resurrection of Jesus.

In the first place, that He came to Jerusalem to the Passover in order to preach and, if necessary, to die there, in the spiritual capital of His country, is intelligible enough, in view of the significance of this feast for the Jewish people. Further, it is hardly deniable that an apprehension, trial, and execution could take place on Nisan 15, the date assigned to the death of Jesus, at any rate by the Synoptic writers.

When, in the second place, our earliest witness for the resurrection, the Apostle Paul, states in 1 Co $15^{4f.}$ that he has received by tradition that Christ was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures, and that He appeared to Cephas, then to others, he puts only the resurrection, not the first Christophany, on the third day: he may therefore have thought of the former as a fact established in another way, perhaps by the finding of the empty grave. Mark's Gospel, when dealing with the third day after the death of Jesus, informs us only that the grave was found empty; Matthew, as we have just seen, certainly gives an account of the resurrection

itself, and in addition, like John, an account of an appearance to the women; Luke and John report also an appearance to others. But this tradition is certainly later: the older tradition laid the scene of the first appearances in Galilee, and therefore gave them a later date than the third day: on this day there was only the discovery of the empty grave. But in whatever way this discovery is to be explained, it may very well be historical fact. For at all events Jesus died on a Friday:[1] the women who wished afterwards to give Him the due rites of burial,[2] could go to the grave on the Sunday morning at the earliest. The belief in the resurrection of Jesus on the third day is fully accounted for without the supposition of any direct or indirect influence from other religions: in fact, no one would ever have thought of any such influence if men had endeavoured, as surely they ought to do, to explain the Christian tradition primarily by that tradition itself.[3]

As for the other specification, "after three days," it is certainly not equivalent to the one which we have been

[1] The objection raised to this (*Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1906, 31 f.) is, in spite of Wellhausen's authority, inconclusive: from three o'clock in the afternoon till sunset was sufficient time for Joseph's visit to Pilate, the summoning of the centurion, the preparations for the burial, and the burial itself.

[2] This is declared (*ibid.* 30) to be unthinkable, but no reasons are given: and if it were unthinkable, it would not necessarily follow that the Sunday "had already attained its full dignity" when this story came into being.

[3] Accordingly there is no need to examine further the fanciful description given by O. Pfleiderer in *Religion und Religionen*, 223 f.: "Since religious usages are never created out of nothing, we are probably at liberty to suppose that the Gentile Christians of Antioch retained their old customs, in accordance with which they had previously celebrated the death and resurrection of Adonis their lord, and that they now merely transferred them to their new Lord, Jesus. So it was a matter of course that Christ should appear to them as the Lord who had, through His very death and resurrection, effected the salvation of His own, and had become the Saviour of the world. At this time the Apostle Paul came to this new Church, to which he had been brought by Barnabas from his native town of Tarsus: he soon felt at home in it, and his work was richly blessed, so that the Church visibly increased. Accordingly, it was only natural that Paul also for his part should accept the usages and ideas which he found already existing in the Gentile-Christian Church at Antioch—for how otherwise would he have worked successfully in its midst? It was the more natural, since all that he found there was closely in keeping with the manner in which he himself had come to believe in Christ." But surely this last circumstance sufficiently explains Paul's views without the aid of any auxiliary hypothesis. Cp. also J. Weiss, *Jesus von Nazareth, Mythus oder Geschichte?* 1910, 32 ff.

discussing: otherwise it would not have been so often in later times replaced by this in Jesus' predictions of His sufferings (Mk 8^{31} 9^{31} 10^{34} and par.). It is more simply explained as a proverbial expression than by the Persian idea to which we have frequently referred. "After a short time," Jesus would say—for one can have no doubt of the historicity of these predictions, at least in their general scope—"after a short time I will rise again."

In the last place, the observance of Sunday is presupposed not only in the Apocalypse (1^{10}), but even before that by Paul (1 Co 16^{2}) and the author of the We-sections in the Acts of the Apostles (20^{7}); subsequently also by the Gospel of John in its dating of the entry into Jerusalem, and of the appearance to the disciples with Thomas. It may very well have been instituted to commemorate the resurrection of Jesus. Gunkel [1] asks: "How did people come to observe the resurrection-day *each week*?" but surely that was natural enough when there was a weekly Sabbath. The name "the Lord's day," *κυριακὴ ἡμέρα*, might, as Deissmann [2] and Thieme [3] conjecture, follow the analogy of "the Emperor's day," *σεβαστή*: but this supposition is unnecessary.[4] Certainly the name was bound to become current more easily if another and a similar name was already in existence:[5] however, that is not our question here. The observance of Sunday is in itself sufficiently intelligible without supposing that foreign influences have been at work on Christianity.[6]

But often as these influences have been invoked to explain

[1] *Verständnis*, 74.

[2] *Neue Bibelstudien*, 1897, 46 [*Bible Studies*, 218]; *Licht vom Osten*, 261 [Eng. trans. 361].

[3] *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander und das N.T.*, 1906, 15.

[4] Cp. Schürer, "Die siebentägige Woche im Gebrauche der christl. Kirche der ersten Jahrhunderte," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1905, 2, n. 2.

[5] Cp. Thumb, "Die Namen der Wochentage im Griechischen," *Zeitschr. f. deutsche Wortforschung*, 1900, 165.

[6] This account of the matter is certainly also more probable than that of Schwartz (*Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1906, 29), viz. that the Sunday was chosen merely to distinguish Christian usage from the official usage of Judaism. Further, the assertion which he and others make, that the Sunday was first chosen for the day of the resurrection because it was the Lord's day, has been sufficiently met by the discussion above.

the tradition regarding the death and resurrection of Jesus, this mode of explanation has been still more frequently applied to the theory of His descent into Hades, which is to be found in various passages in the New Testament. First of all there is Mt 12^{40}: "*As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*"; but this passage is at all events inappropriate to its context, and therefore may have been no genuine utterance of Jesus; still it would furnish evidence for the ideas of a later age. The same might be said of the words addressed to the penitent thief, Lk 23^{43} "*To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise*," that is to say, if we assume that Paradise is to be thought of as a part of the underworld. Whether in Ac $2^{24.\ 27.\ 31}$ there is reference to a sojourn of Jesus in the underworld, must, of course, remain doubtful: the first passage, according to the best manuscripts, runs thus: ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου, and the phrase ἐγκαταλείπειν εἰς ᾅδην in the other two passages may be translated "leave in Hades." But there is less obscurity in Ro 10^{7}: for when Paul there connects the saying of Dt 30^{13} (which he cites in the form τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον;) with a Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν, and does not reject this as something meaningless, he probably supposes that Christ has actually been in Hades. The best-known passage, which speaks of His preaching to the spirits in prison (1 P $3^{19f.}$), appears to me undoubtedly to refer to that, as also the expression κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς,[1] Eph 4^{9}; in short, the view is to be found in the most diverse parts of the New Testament, and may therefore be discussed at this point.

To disregard, in the first instance, the particular form in which the view appears in the First Epistle of Peter, it is derived by Bousset,[2] Gardner,[3] O. Pfleiderer,[4] Gunkel,[5] Zimmern,[6]

[1] Cp. Clemen, *Niedergefahren zu den Toten*, 1900, 115 ff., 152 ff.; "The First Epistle of St. Peter and the Book of Enoch," *Expositor*, 1902, 6th ser., vi. 316 ff.

[2] *Offenbarung*, 198; *Religion*, 407, n. 3; *Hauptprobleme*, 255 ff.

[3] *Exploratio Evangelica*, 1899, 265 ff.

[4] *Urchristentum*, ii. 288 [Eng. trans. iii. 410].

[5] *Verständnis*, 72 f.; and in J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 52.

[6] *Keilinschriften*, 388, 563.

A. Meyer,[1] Soltau,[2] whether directly or indirectly, from Babylonian, Mandaean, or even Greek religion. But the first of these could have influenced only Judaism, and in Judaism we find no actual trace of such an expectation regarding the Messiah:[3] in fact, there is no plausible reason for supposing that the Jewish Messiah had any connexion whatever with the Babylonian deities of light. Further, Hibil Zîvâ's descent into hell—for it is such a descent that is in question here—has no particular bearing (as Bousset[4] himself admits) either on the New Testament passages or on the Gnostic speculations regarding the descent of the Redeemer. The visits of Greek heroes to Hades are made in their lifetime, not after death, as in the case of Jesus: why then are the two things always compared? But, above all, in view of the ideas then prevailing in regard to the conditions of the life after death, the whole of the Christian conception is so very natural that one would have had to assume its existence if it had nowhere been explicitly attested.[5] And the theory that

[1] *Auferstehung*, 10, 80.

[2] *Fortleben*, 146 f. H. Schmidt, *Jona*, 172 ff., appears to think only of the later literary and pictorial representations.

[3] Monnier, *La première épître de l'apôtre Pierre*, 1900, 296, n. 1: "La foi au Messie qui évangélise les morts ne se retrouve pas dans les croyances juives du temps. . . . C'est beaucoup plus tard, dans le Bereschith Rabba que cette croyance apparaît chez les Juifs. . . . Mais ce que l'on ne trouve pas chez les contemporains, c'est l'idée que le sort des âmes puisse changer d'une façon essentielle après la mort."

[4] *Hauptprobleme*, 256, 259. In *Offenbarung*, 198, he says: "Perhaps it is not accidental . . . that the idea of the descent into Hades appears where it does in the vision of the 'one like unto a son of man.' The widely ramified myths of the 'man' (Primal Man) and of the descent into Hades seem to be closely connected." But this presupposes an interpretation of Rev 1^{18} which is by no means necessary; and even if one should accept it, no conclusion could be drawn from it regarding the origin of this idea. This argument holds also against W. Bauer, *Handkommentar zum N.T.* iv. 427.

[5] Accordingly Bousset has no justification for his recent statement (*Hauptprobleme*, 255): "It is only the connexion here demonstrated that explains why the theory of Jesus' descent into Hades found an entrance into the Christian religion so early as the period covered by the New Testament. The certainty with which allusions are already made throughout the New Testament to the 'descent' as to a fact that is assumed as a matter of course, is explained only on the supposition that some borrowing had taken place, and that the idea of the descent into Hades already existed before it was applied to the person of Jesus."

Jesus preached in Hades was one so obvious, if earlier generations had lived without knowledge of the gospel, that it could arise, in fact it was bound to arise, even in the absence of any foreign prototype.[1] The words which are put into the mouth of Wisdom in the Latin text of Sir 24[32] "*Penetrabo omnes inferiores partes terrae, et inspiciam omnes dormientes, et illuminabo omnes sperantes in Domino*," may possibly have had an influence: but then it would not be a case of non-Jewish influences. Tiele,[2] who calls attention to the tradition that the teaching of Zarathustra was promulgated in the kingdom of Yima by the bird Karshipta (*Vd.* 2. 42, *Sacred Books*, iv. 21), describes the similar idea in Christian thought as one "which has arisen from the same need." So, too, Seydel[3] regards Buddha's visit to hell, to which there is an allusion in *Lalita Vistara* (2, Gâtha 8, trad. par Foucaux, i. 14; cp. also Lefmann, *Lalita Vistara*, i., 1874, 98), as one of the parallels which are accounted for without supposing interdependence: it seems, moreover, to be rather a distant parallel, since there is no mention of preaching. And there is still less correspondence between the view of the First Epistle of Peter and the legend (contained in the Kara*nd*avyûha) regarding Avalokitesvara's descent into hell—which even Cowell[4] and van den Bergh van Eysinga[5] compare only with the description of the *descensus ad inferos* in the Gospel of Nicodemus. We may therefore at the outset leave that legend on one side, and need not seek for other parallels: even the particular form which the idea of Christ's descent into Hades has assumed in the First Epistle of Peter is entirely accounted for without the theory of foreign influences.[6]

[1] Cp. Clemen, *Niedergefahren*, 134 ff. [2] *Geschichte*, ii. 267 f.

[3] *Evangelium*, 183, 267 f., 299; *Buddha-Legende*, 55.

[4] "The Northern Buddhist Legend of Avalokitéswara's Descent into the Hell Avíchi," *Journ. of Philol.*, 1876, 222.

[5] *Einflüsse*, 87 f.

[6] Also H. Holtzmann, "Höllenfahrt im N.T.," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1908, 285 ff., says in the first instance (287): "Given on the one hand the ancient belief in the soul and the conception of the world as a three-storied structure, and given on the other hand the idea that one who had died on the cross and risen from the dead on the third day was truly the Messiah, the myth [of the descent into Hades] could by logical necessity arise quite spontaneously within

The same is true, finally, of the belief in the present and future position of Jesus. That He Himself expected to come again as Judge, although otherwise He set Himself entirely alongside of men, is easily understood; for that was the prevailing conception in regard to the Son of Man, which Jesus was bound to attach to His own person, since He saw that He would in no other way be able to fulfil His Messianic calling. Further, when even in the early Church He was invoked in prayer (Ac 7^{59}), when the Gospel of Matthew (18^{20} $28^{18.\ 20}$) puts into His mouth the words, "*Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world*,"—these things can be explained by the expectation to which we have referred, coupled with the belief in the resurrection of Jesus; for in view of the current ideas in regard to the afterlife, such a resurrection marked Him out as more than human. And with this again is connected the fact that Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews represent Jesus as being after death highly exalted and crowned with glory and honour (Ph $2^{9f.}$, He 2^{9}), although they attribute to Him pre-existence and co-operation in the making and upholding of all things. How this combination

a region of conceptions exclusively Christian." It is only at the close that he writes thus (295 f.): "The connexion of the promised resurrection of the dead with the resurrection of Christ Himself which first made the former possible . . . was first established by the myth of the descent into hell, which on its part, no doubt, corresponded to a postulate of the Christian conscience, but still could find its concrete and picturable form so easily, and could, thanks to that, win its way to acceptance so rapidly, for the simple reason that the whole atmosphere of the time offered such inducements and such abundant means for this." I see even here an unnecessary concession to the religious-historical school; in how unobjectionable a sense Holtzmann speaks of a myth of the descent into hell is shown by his introductory remark: "Above—below! Ascent —descent! In every place where the complexes of ideas which these expressions imply are seriously intended and are to be taken literally, it is justifiable and necessary (if the Copernican system has really superseded the ancient one, and if, further, the spatial ideas of a critical theory of knowledge have attained supremacy) to use with all frankness the word *mythological*." At the most, one may suppose a connexion with non-Christian myths only in so far as they facilitated the diffusion of the Christian speculation: but even this modified view is rejected by Loofs, "Christ's Descent into Hell," *Transactions of the Third Intern. Congress for the Hist. of Rel.*, 1908, ii. 290 ff., 301.

of views is to be explained is a question which cannot, of course, be examined here: at all events the conceptions which they shared with those who went before them can be understood without supposing any foreign influence at work. It is not even necessary to point out that among the Jews, as we have seen (p. 140), the belief prevailed that certain righteous men would come back to life before the end—a return, however, which would not rank alongside of the appearing of the Son of Man as Judge: still less occasion is there to search for Gentile originals for this anticipation and the ideas connected with it.[1] And yet, as we have repeatedly seen in regard to other questions, such foreign ideas may have *aided* the development we speak of, *in Christianity or Judaism*: the question is, Are there real evidences of such ideas in the surroundings of primitive Christianity, or of Judaism before it?

One might even, without dwelling on the point, attempt at once to show that Judaism *actually* shared such notions, *i.e.* that it believed in the apotheosis of great men. Artapanus relates (in Eus. *Praep. Ev.* ix. 27. 432) that Moses, after establishing a cult in honour of his mother Merris, was also himself reverenced as a god. But Jewish thought betrays no further knowledge of this circumstance. The Letter of Aristeas (135 ff.) represents Eleazar as offering the most obstinate resistance to the deification of men who have made some useful discovery, and similarly the Book of Wisdom says in its condemnation of idolatry (14^{15}): "*For a father worn with untimely grief, making an image of the child quickly taken away, now honoured him as a god which was then a dead man, and delivered to those that were under him mysteries and solemn rites.*" Thus, even in the case of Jewish *Christians*, we must not presuppose any tendency towards such a deification that could have facilitated their acceptance of the Christology already existent in the primitive Church: on the other hand, in the case of *some Gentile Christians* there may have been such a predisposition.[2]

[1] As against Barrows, "Mythical and Legendary Elements in the N.T.," *New World*, 1899, 285 ff.

[2] Cp. Harnack, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1908, 129 [Eng. trans. *The Acts of the*

For in *their* environment such views were certainly to be found. It is true that in Egypt the worship of deceased kings played no great part in ancient times: "still smaller," remarks Wiedemann,[1] "was the number of private persons who received worship not merely as dead men but also as gods, and, so far as we have to do with clearly established instances, such worship was always kept within comparatively narrow limits." It was only under Hellenistic influence that this was altered. "To make heroes of the illustrious dead, more especially of the founders of cities," Wendland[2] has recently said, "was a practice known to the Greeks even before Alexander, and in the smaller circle of kinsfolk or friends the piety of survivors might exalt their loved ones after death to such a position. . . . Aristotle erected an altar to Plato, and in his hymn to Virtue celebrated the dead Hermeias in forms verging on apotheosis. Religious worship was paid to Epicurus by his followers, and in Alexandria there was a cult of Homer." And so far as there was a Roman element present in the later Churches, particularly in the West, the facts which Elter[3] recalls are suggestive. Ennius put Romulus and then Scipio among the gods: in the same way Cicero (*Ad Att.* 12. 12; 12. 18; 12. 36) intended to build a temple and establish a cult in honour of his dead daughter Tullia. As a proof of the influence of this belief upon Christology, Grill[4] cites in particular the description of Jesus as ἀρχηγός (Ac 3^{15} 5^{31}, He 2^{10} 12^{2}), which Rohde[5] calls the characteristic designation of the hero: but this very remark shows that the belief in heroes can *not* have done much to render Christology intelligible. Elter[6] observes that these new gods (even the

Apostles, 1909, 159]: "Those who suppose that the legend of the Ascension of our Lord took form on the soil of Gentile Christianity and in dependence upon the myths of the apotheosis of heroes and emperors are certainly mistaken; and yet it is no wonder that these legends when they reached the genuine Hellene were especially welcome, and therefore regarded as especially worthy of credence."

[1] *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1904, 475 f.

[2] In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 74.

[3] *Donarem pateras . . . Horat. Carm. iv. 8*, 1907, 27 ff.

[4] *Untersuchungen*, i. 331, n. 5.

[5] *Psyche* (1894), [2]1898, i. 169, ii. 348.

[6] *Donarem pateras*, 40, 51.

rulers worshipped as gods, with whom we are not here concerned) did not possess religious influence in the smallest degree: "they inspired in the religious sentiment neither fear nor devotion; in this respect they are inferior even to the Christian saints: for they themselves are neither living gods nor even advocates with God." And the same was, of course, true of the frequent designation of an Emperor as the son of God. Accordingly this idea, even in cases where it was perhaps retained by Gentile Christians, would not help them greatly: their faith in Christ was of another sort: and, at any rate, the writers of the books admitted into the New Testament probably never thought of comparing their faith with ideas which were entertained regarding Homer or Plato, Romulus or Scipio.

b. The Triadic Formulæ.

Though the doctrine of the Trinity is not to be found in the New Testament—for the words of 1 Jn $5^{7f.}$ are notoriously spurious—still God or the Father, Jesus Christ or the Son, and the Holy Spirit are often named together. The best-known instances of this are the so-called baptismal command in Mt 28^{19}, which was probably so worded from the very first: "*Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*"; and the so-called apostolic salutation, 2 Co 13^{14} "*The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all*"; perhaps, in addition, the passage in 1 Co $12^{4ff.}$ "*Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all.*" But also in 2 Th $2^{13f.}$, 1 P 1^{1}, Jude ^{21} there is mention of God the Father, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit: the naming of the three together must therefore have been frequent.

Now there is no evidence of the existence of such a formula in Jewish thought: for if, as Gfrörer[1] points out, we learn from Origen (*De Princ.* i. 3. 4) that his Jewish authority

[1] *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i., 1838, 327 ff.

explained to him the two seraphim of Is 6^3 as the Son of God and the Holy Spirit, that is a different matter: again, the Ascension of Isaiah, in which ($9^{32.36}$) the angel of the Holy Spirit appears beside the Lord of Glory, is a Christian production: and, finally, in En 61^{10} (the passage which Gfrörer has mainly in view) there is no mention of another power, but of "*the other powers on the earth, over the water.*" It is therefore not in itself astonishing that a search has been made in other religions for a prototype of those triadic formulae in the New Testament. In reference to them and to the institutions of primitive Christianity, which we have next to discuss, it is, in fact, particularly easy to understand why such a search should be made, if, indeed, Deissmann's principle is sound: "Where it is a case of inward emotions and religious experiences, and the naïve expression of these emotions and experiences in word, symbol, and act, I should always try first to regard the particular fact as 'analogical.' Where it is a case of a formula used in worship, a professional liturgical usage, or the formulation of some doctrine, I should always try first to regard the particular fact as 'genealogical.'"[1]

We need not dwell upon the older theories, which are here remarkably numerous. Among the more recent writers, Zimmern[2] compares the frequent association of Ea, Marduk and the fire-god Gibil, Girru or Musku, in exorcistic texts from Babylonia, and declares this parallel to be the more noteworthy since the fire-god, like other gods, but also in an especial degree, appears as intercessor (παράκλητος), while in the New Testament "the Spirit" and "fire" are closely connected. But Krüger[3] rightly urges the objection that according to the faith of Israel (which is explained by Israel's original conception of God) *all* heavenly beings appear in a fiery form, and that in the Johannine writings, where alone the expression is found in the New Testament, the intercessor is in the first place Christ, not the Spirit. The fact that at a

[1] *Licht vom Osten*, 190 f. [Eng. trans. 262].

[2] *Vater, Sohn u. Fürsprecher in der babyl. Gottesverehrung*, 1896; *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1899, 175, n. 1; *Keilinschriften*, 418 f., 440.

[3] *Das Dogma von der Dreieinigkeit u. Gottmenschheit*, 1905, 51.

later time—in Cyril and in the formula given by the *Apostolic Constitutions*—the Spirit is called παράκλητος, can, of course, prove nothing for an earlier period: no more can the formula which Usener[1] justly presupposes for the understanding of the 48th (or 49th) Apostolic Canon, *i.e.* the formula, "*I baptize thee into the name of God, without beginning, and of the Son and of the Paraclete.*" Further, Zimmern himself admits that in Babylonian religion other gods also are intercessors, and at last he remarks incidentally:[2] "In view of the close relations in which Nebo stands to Gibil-Musku . . . the figure of Nebo also, the son of Marduk, might have been referred to in the following passage." Hehn[3] accordingly harmonizes the biblical Triad (it is not yet a real Trinity) with the alleged Babylonian Trinity Ea, Marduk, and Nebo: for the identification of Nebo with "Spirit," he finds a proof in the fact that Nabû, the speaker, reminds one involuntarily of נָבִיא, the prophet; but it is the Holy Spirit, he says, who illumines and inspires the prophets. However, there is nothing said anywhere of this in the passages cited above from the New Testament: this explanation is, therefore, no better than the first.

Another recent theory is still less admissible. On the ground that the Spirit is originally female, and at the baptism of Jesus appears in the form of a dove, Zimmern[4] would trace a collateral connexion between the Spirit and Ishtar, whose sacred bird was the dove. Now, however the case may stand with this narrative, which can only be discussed on a later page, at all events the Spirit in those triadic formulae is never understood as female. If Usener[5] maintains that He is so understood in the baptismal command, on the ground that the Gospel of Matthew was originally written in Aramaic, where the Spirit is certainly female, he is relying upon an untenable tradition. Again, the Gnostic conception of the Spirit as female, which is to be found in baptismal formulae and elsewhere, cannot be regarded as decisive for the original

[1] "Dreiheit," *Rhein. Museum*, 1903, 44.
[2] *Vater*, 7, n. 1.
[3] *Hymnen u. Gebete an Marduk*, 1903, 23 f.
[4] *Keilinschriften*, 440.
[5] *Rhein. Museum*, 1903, 41 f.; cp. also his previous publication, *Das Weihnachtsfest*, 1889, 116 ff., 177; Soltau, *Fortleben*, 99.

conception: of course, as Anz [1] shows, Ishtar actually influenced the Gnostic idea. Such an influence is still clearer in the case of the Mandaean Rûhâ: but Rûhâ must not be made an argument for the female character of the Spirit in Christianity. On the contrary, Mandaeism makes this whole derivation of the triadic formulae in the New Testament from Babylonian thought one degree more difficult than we have yet shown. For in pre-Christian times, in Judaism, no influence of the one or the other Babylonian Trinity is observable; and accordingly it is only through the medium of a later form of religion that they could have influenced Christianity. But we find nothing corresponding in Mandaeism: for the Three, in whose name baptism is administered,[2] are something totally dissimilar. Even the Persian Trinity, Ormazd, Mithra, and Fire, whom Zimmern [3] would perhaps make the connecting link between the Babylonian and the Christian Trinity, are latterly no more mentioned: in the cult of Mithras there appear beside this god only Cautes and Cautopates, and these, as Cumont [4] shows, are originally nothing but subsidiary names for Mithras.

The case is no better for the theory that these Christian formulae were produced by Egyptian influences, though Zimmern finally regards it as possible, and Amélineau [5] positively maintains it. Again, the combination of the Buddha, the Law, and the Assembly of the Clergy in an inscription of Asoka, in which Seydel [6] finds a parallel to the Christian formulae, is latterly explained by him as due rather to the sacred character of the number three, which is such a common feature in all religions and tongues. Of Greek prototypes—and in this matter one would most readily turn to Greece—there are no authentic and detailed proofs: it is, in fact, not even permissible to use the general argument that, as Usener [7]

[1] *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, xv. 4. 90 ff.

[2] Cp. Brandt, *Mand. Rel.* 105 f., 225 f.

[3] *Keilinschriften*, 419.

[4] *Textes*, i. 208 f.

[5] *Essai sur l'évolution historique et philosophique des idées morales dans l'Égypte ancienne*, 408.

[6] *Evangelium*, 50 f., 274 ff.

[7] *Rhein. Museum*, 1903, 1 ff., 161 ff., 321 ff.; cp. also Soltau, *Fortleben*, 97 ff.

most copiously proves, there was everywhere a tendency to represent the Godhead in the form of a Trinity. For the Spirit was not originally a person: he appears as such for the first time in the baptismal formula in Matthew. Again, it does not seem to be indubitable—though even Krüger [1] accepts the view—that this formula originated in the triple immersion (supposed to have been borrowed from paganism), and was to this extent partially of pagan origin: the development may just as well have been in the opposite direction, and at all events the combination of Father, Son, and Spirit was common apart from that. Its roots lie in that predilection for the number three, which elsewhere in the New Testament has produced other combinations of the same sort. Thus in Lk 9^{26} and 1 Ti 5^{21} we have God, Christ, and the angels named together, in Rev 1^{4} God, Christ, and the seven Spirits —in fact, in this last passage we have Christ described by three names, the faithful witness, the first-born of the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth. And so we may finally derive the formula in Ro 11^{36} "*Of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things*"—not, with Reitzenstein,[2] from the inscription on a magic-ring, or the fundamental formula of Egypto-Greek mysticism, but from the widespread predilection for the triad.

3. The Institutions of Primitive Christianity.

a. Divine Worship and Church Organization.

With reference to this subject, like the preceding one, it is hard to say whether it should be dealt with here or only at a later stage. For Jesus appears to have given no directions regarding divine worship and church organization. No doubt in Mt $18^{15ff.}$ (to pass over Mt 16^{18}, which must not be cited in this connexion) we read the following words: "*If thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone; . . . if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more . . .; if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church; and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as*

[1] *Dogma*, 47. [2] *Poimandres*, 39, n. 1.

the Gentile and the publican." However, though Jesus might have expressed Himself in this way from the Jewish standpoint, such casuistry is so much in conflict with His usual mode of speech and His declared principles that the saying cannot be genuine. In Luke (17[3]) and probably in the Discourse-document, which is here drawn upon, the injunction takes the form: "*If thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him.*" But though Jesus may not have expressed Himself thus in regard to these matters, still He actually officiated at divine worship. And since the divine worship of the early Church was probably of the same character as the Jewish, and even that of later Churches followed Jewish models, it is not unfitting to discuss at this point the general question of divine worship in primitive Christianity.

Jesus taught in the synagogue—an institution of which we hear first in Ps 74[8], although it is probably older: in fact it perhaps originated in the time of the Exile. Tiele [1] has accordingly conjectured that the Persian mode of worship was taken as the model, since in Persia worship was not limited to one spot, but could be held in various places. But this theory is by no means necessary, as Stave [2] has shown in detail: the synagogue may very well have arisen merely from the needs of the Jewish people. "We are altogether ignorant of the stage of development which the cult of the Persian religion had at that time reached. We do not even know how far the systematized form of the regulations for worship and purification—and this form perhaps existed at that time—was obligatory for others than priests and Magi, or whether, finally, a number of other rites largely naturalistic were also observed and favoured by the people." The Greek *term* συναγωγή is used besides in reference to Greek associations for worship, but only in the sense of assembly,[3] as in Ja 2[2].

At a later time (Ac 11[30] 15[2. 4. 6. 22f.] 16[4] 21[18]) we find elders at the head of the primitive Church. This name was probably borrowed from Judaism: indeed, in purely Jewish

[1] *De godsdienst van Zarathustra*, 1864, 283.

[2] *Einfluss*, 132 ff.

[3] Cp. Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 433 [Eng. trans. II. ii. 54 ff.].

localities the elders of the place were also the elders of the synagogue. On the other hand, when we meet the term in connexion with Gentile-Christian Churches (Ac 14^{23} 20^{17}, 1 P 5^{1}, 2 Jn [1], 3 Jn [1], Tit 1^{5}, 1 Ti $5^{17.\ 19}$), it might be *collaterally* derived from the phraseology current in Greek communities, or—what is alone of interest for us here—in Greek associations for worship.[1]

Divine worship in the Pauline Churches, which are better known to us than other Churches, conformed, as we have already seen, to the Jewish and Jewish-Christian pattern. But we do meet in these Pauline Churches a number of new phenomena, which we may at once proceed to discuss. It is true that, according to the tradition on which Ac 2 is based, there was "speaking with tongues" at the first Christian Pentecost, and afterwards when Cornelius was converted (Ac 10^{46} 11^{15}); just as the Testament of Job (46 ff.) shows that such glossolalia was not unknown in Judaism.[2] But in 1 Co 12^{10} $14^{26ff.}$ we hear, besides, of προφητεία or ἀποκάλυψις —for these mean the same thing—and ψαλμός, and must explain the former as an ecstatic utterance, and the latter as a Christian poem. Now Reitzenstein [3] has justly inferred from the Naassenic sermon already discussed (p. 155) that in pagan cults there were functions assigned to the ᾠδός and the προφήτης, both of whom believed that their utterance was due to a divine revelation. Further, the epigraphic evidence abundantly proves the existence of prophets in heathen cults: [4] and we know, too, from Celsus (in Origen, *Contra Cels.* vii. 8 f.) and Lucian (*Alex.* 13) that phenomena similar to the speaking with tongues were already to be found in paganism—in fact, we may infer this even from the circumstance that Paul without further explanation uses the expression γλώσσῃ or γλώσσαις λαλεῖν in that particular

[1] Cp. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 154 f., *Neue Bibelstudien*, 60 ff. [*Bible Studies*, 155 f., 233 ff.]; Ramsay, "Historical Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians," *Expositor*, 1900, 6th ser., ii. 377 f.; Hauschild, "Πρεσβύτεροι in Ägypten," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1903, 235 ff.

[2] Cp. James, *Apocrypha Ancedota*, ii., *Texts and Studies*, v. 1, 1897, 133 ff.

[3] *Poimandres*, 203.

[4] Cp. Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, 62 ff. [*Bible Studies*, 235 ff.]; Thieme, *Inschriften*, 19 f.

sense. Yet here again it is only the *expression* which has been borrowed: the *thing itself*, like the ecstatic preaching and "psalm"-singing, was altogether underived. A foreign influence might be posited only to this extent, that some Christians may, owing to their heathen antecedents, have been accustomed to pass into such ecstasies and then to express themselves in this fashion.[1]

The organization of the Pauline Churches, if that subject may be treated here, is explained by Heinrici[2] as based on the model of pagan associations for worship. But the similarity between the two is not very great. The Christian Churches had no president and probably also no common purse — otherwise Paul would have expressed himself differently when he speaks of the collection for the Christian community at Jerusalem. Further, in Ro 13^{7} τέλος cannot signify a contribution for behoof of the brotherhood, but, in the light of the context (and of Christ's words regarding the tribute money, which were probably in Paul's mind here), must refer to taxes paid to the State.

Other instances of real similarity may be explained without supposing that the Christian Churches derived any feature from the associations for worship: and this is true especially of the part played in both by the common meals. Even the equalization of men and women, masters and slaves, was a natural deduction from Christian principles, but might, of course, be collaterally derived from corresponding usages in the associations for worship. It is no evidence to the contrary that Paul in 1 Co $11^{3ff.}$ $14^{34f.}$ does not permit women to pray or to preach in the church with uncovered head like men, or even to criticize a male preacher: when foreign ideas or usages had a determining influence upon his thought, that was the very time, as we have already seen (p. 61), when he could lag at some distance behind.

[1] Cp. also Zahn, *Epiktet*, 38: "We learn quite incidentally that the pupils occasionally read a text aloud on which the teacher wished to found his remarks (*Diss.* i. 10. 7, i. 26. 1, 13). But I cannot discover the authority for Bonhöffer's statement (p. 2) that the writings of Chrysippus 'were the basis of his [Epictetus'] instruction and homilies, much as Biblical texts are for Christian sermons.'"

[2] Finally in his work, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 5 ff.

Elsewhere, it is true, he has probably borrowed detached expressions, a proceeding natural enough. Still, the comparison of the Church to a body (1 Co $12^{12ff.}$, Ro $12^{4f.}$) has hardly any connexion with the designation of the societies as *corpora*; and since the name of brother, as applied to a fellow-Christian, impressed heathens so profoundly, it cannot have enjoyed great vogue in pagan societies. But all the more certainly is the term ἰδιώτης, which is applied in 1 Co 14^{16} to the person who has not yet joined the fellowship of the Church, derived from the phraseology current in the associations for worship: and again, the circumstance that there was a reserved τόπος τοῦ ἰδιώτου, is probably to be traced to heathen cults. Similarly it is well known that the terms ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι with a technical reference to religious officials are frequently found in inscriptions.[1]

b. Baptism.

Christian baptism was preceded by the baptism of John, which in fact, as will at once be evident, served as its model. We must therefore first of all speak of the baptism of John, though, I admit, it is mentioned only in the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle to the Hebrews—and in the last of these only if it be granted that the teaching in regard to baptism in 6^2 has at least a partial reference to the difference between Christian and Johannine baptism.

In Mk 1^4, Lk 3^3, the baptism of John is described as the "baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins," and this is probably to be understood in the sense of Ac 2^{38} 22^{16}, viz. as meaning that baptism, not repentance, occasions the forgiveness of sins. But if that is so, the statement cannot be historical: for in the rest of John's teaching we find no trace of such a regard for ceremonies: what he desires is honest repentance—nothing more. And even inconsistently he could not well attribute such an importance to baptism: for how could he have arrived at such an idea? From Jewish cleansings—which were performed repeatedly and by each one for himself—one looked for the removal of Levitical

[1] Cp. Thieme, *Inschriften*, 17 f., 32 f.

pollutions: sometimes they were practised only because such injunctions had at one time been given. "A corpse does not pollute, nor does water purify," such was the opinion of Johanan ben Zakkai, who was still alive in the first century, "but the Holy One hath said, 'One law have I appointed, one judgment have I pronounced. Thou art not empowered to contravene my judgment, which stands recorded: this is the precept of my law.'"[1] As for the Essenic cleansings (Jos. *BJ* ii. 8. 5, 7, 9 f.), it cannot be proved, *pace* Bousset[2] and Chapuis,[3] that any of them, even those performed on admission into the sect, were supposed to have a sacramental effect in the ordinary sense of the term: for the view that the exhortation in Sib. iv. 164 f.: "*Wash the whole body in running streams, and, stretching your hands to heaven, pray for forgiveness*," is Essenic, is for that very reason far from probable. In the second place, it can hardly be supposed that the Baptist was in this one point indebted to the Essenes, with whose other views he shows no acquaintance. Nor do we know anything at all of any other circles that attached such importance to baptism, and that might have influenced John:[4] the passage just quoted from the Sibylline Oracles originated in the Diaspora, where, as we shall see on a later page, such ideas are intelligible enough. Had these ideas been in existence in Palestine, and had the Baptist identified himself with them, it is probable that he would hardly have caused the astonishment which found expression in the name conferred on him: he must therefore have assigned a *special* meaning to baptism; and, according to all the evidence, that meaning —for which Is 1^{16}, Jer 4^{14} and other passages from the prophets had prepared the way—can only have been that it was a symbol of conversion.[5]

[1] Cp. Bousset, *Religion*, 149. [2] *Ibid.* 231, 529.

[3] "L'influence de l'essénisme sur les origines chrétiennes," *Revue de théol. et de phil.*, 1903, 201 f.

[4] The Baptist sects among the Samaritans, to which Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, 382 ff., calls attention, are probably later.

[5] Wernle therefore is incorrect when he speaks [*Die Anfänge unserer Religion* (1901), ²1904, 25 (Eng. trans. 35 f.)] of the baptism of John as a sacramental cleansing, and Bousset also when he says (*Religion*, 231): "We know too little of the baptism of John to be able either to affirm or to deny that it had a sacramental value." (It may be remarked that this would contradict by

If it had been a new institution, and altogether independent of the baptism of John, Christian baptism might have had another signification. But such complete independence is improbable: for one thing, the baptismal command in Mt 28^{19}, of which there is an echo in Mk $16^{15f.}$, cannot be historical, at all events in its present form. The view that the risen Lord did not impart such new instructions to His disciples will, of course, win immediate acceptance only among those who regard the Christophanies as visions: but even at a previous time Jesus cannot, I think, have instituted a form of baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; for such a triadic formula of baptism—and that is surely what is wanted to correspond with the baptismal command—is not found elsewhere before the second century.[1] Nor can he, in contradiction of other sayings, particularly Mt 10^{23}, have purposed any mission to the heathen: when such a mission was recognized by the early Church at Jerusalem, it was only in response to Paul's urgent appeal, and that appeal made no reference to any such saying of Jesus. And if, in presence of these considerations, one could still adhere to the view that Jesus had perhaps previously in a general sense instituted baptism in His own name, even that is rendered very improbable by Paul's words in 1 Co 1^{17}, "*Christ sent me not to baptize.*" To say that the Apostle did not feel that that was *his* vocation, or even that he had *heard* nothing of such a command of Jesus, is clearly an argument which the embarrassed reasoner should use only in the direst extremity.

This saying of Paul almost certainly precludes the supposition that Jesus had Himself, or through His disciples, merely continued the practice of John. His so doing would have been virtually equivalent to a commission to baptize.

anticipation the assertion made in *Hauptprobleme*, 283, regarding the baptism of John.) The most convincing treatment of this matter is probably to be found in Zurhellen, *Johannes der Täufer u. sein Verhältnis zum Judentum*, 1903, 45 ff., and Innitzer, *Johannes der Täufer*, 1908, 205 ff.

[1] The formula εἰς τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου, or the like, still occurs in the second century; but that does not prove that a triadic formula of baptism was in existence even at an earlier time, when we always hear only of a baptism in the name of Christ, or find it presupposed, as *e.g.* in 1 Co $1^{13ff.}$.

And further, there would probably be some inconsistency between such action and Jesus' manner of speech when in His counter-question to the members of the Sanhedrin he said, "*The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men?*" (Mk 11[30] and par.), for that question implied that the observance of the rite had not been continued, and that it belonged to the past. But the baptism of John probably served as a model, since we have the evidence not only of the Acts of the Apostles—which might be unhistorical—but also of Paul (1 Co 12[13]) that baptism was common in the early Church. The baptism of proselytes was, no doubt, customary at that time, but this cannot have been the starting-point: for, in the first place, only Gentiles would then have been baptized—but, in point of fact, Paul speaks expressly of Jews as well; and, secondly, it would have been the introduction of a purificatory rite such as Jesus had definitely condemned. It is more probable, therefore, that the baptism of John, in the sense established above, was revived, a perfectly natural proceeding at a time when, owing to the belief in the resurrection of Jesus, the expectation of the end had awakened to fresh and more vigorous life.[1] If the disciples of the Baptist held themselves aloof from the Church, we may associate that circumstance with their attitude and that of their master towards the Messiahship of Jesus: baptism, however, was, in the first instance at least, never regarded by the early Church in any other way than John had regarded it. When, therefore, the Book of Acts, in its account of the first Christian Pentecost, represents Peter as preaching (2[38]), "*Be baptized every one of you . . . unto the remission of your sins*," this must be unhistorical. But who was it that first promulgated the new estimate of baptism?

There is at present a widespread idea that Paul was the first to interpret baptism primarily as a sacrament—whether in the Catholic or in the orthodox-Lutheran sense. O. Pfleiderer,[2]

[1] The different conclusion which Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 1903, 271 f., draws from 1 Co 1 is unwarranted.

[2] *Urchristentum*, i. 295 ff., 333 [Eng. trans. i. 413 ff., 467]: "It is quite true that Paul introduced the sacraments into Christianity"; *Christusbild*, 79 ff.

Anrich,[1] H. Holtzmann,[2] Harnack,[3] Gunkel,[4] Sokolowski,[5] Wrede,[6] express such an opinion; and similarly Heitmüller,[7] who, like Wernle,[8] arbitrarily postulates the same view even for primitive Christianity, makes no attempt to prove his thesis until he comes to Paul. Von Dobschütz[9] also agrees with him to a certain extent; and there is unconditional agreement—to say nothing of earlier writers—in the case of Rendtorff,[10] Grussendorf,[11] Bousset,[12] Jülicher,[13] and Lietzmann.[14] If, therefore, a different view is to be put forward here, it will not be done without a detailed statement of proofs.

When, in the first place, Paul says in Gal 3[27] "*As many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ*," that expression can undoubtedly, without reference to the context, be understood as though the believer, by baptism, were incorporated with Christ, or on the other hand received Christ into himself. But the argument at this point is that all those are sons of God who no longer stand under the taskmaster, the Law: Christ is considered, therefore, as the Son of God *in this sense*, and "put on" can only mean "step into His position." So here, at any rate, it is not asserted that

[Eng. trans. 117 ff.]. On the other hand, in *Religion u. Religionen*, 228: "Paul was certainly not the first who introduced them: there is no doubt that he found them already existing in the Church at Antioch."

[1] *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, 110; "Evangelischer u. katholischer Sakramentsbegriff," *Arch. d. Strassb. Pastoralkonf.*, 1905, 350 f.

[2] *Neutest. Theologie*, 1897, ii. 179 ff.; "Sakramentliches im N.T.," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1904, 58 ff.

[3] *Die Mission u. Ausbreitung des Christentums*, 171 [Eng. trans. 289].

[4] *Verständnis*, 83 ff.; also in J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 53.

[5] *Die Begriffe Geist u. Leben bei Paulus*, 1903, 274.

[6] *Paulus*, 1904, 70 f.

[7] *Im Namen Jesu*, 319 ff.; *Taufe u. Abendmahl bei Paulus*, 1904, 9 ff. In *Abendmahl, Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, i. 1909, 39, he lays down the principle: "To expect a completely unified interpretation of a rite and to insist on finding it, is from the very outset a mistake," but in this, as in other matters also, he judges primitive Christianity in the light of its later form.

[8] *Anfänge*, 93, 95, 196 [Eng. trans. i. 132 ff., 273].

[9] "Sakrament u. Symbol im Urchristentum," *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 1 ff.

[10] *Die Taufe im Urchristentum im Lichte der neueren Forschungen*, 1905, 13 ff.

[11] "Abendmahl u. Taufe bei Paulus," *Zeitschr. f. d. evang. Religionsunterricht*, 1907–8, 62 f.

[12] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 1. 50, 83, 134.

[13] *Ibid.* ii. 2. 35 f.

[14] *Handbuch*, iii. 29 f., 120 f.

baptism is really the cause of the *εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ*,[1] and baptism as such is not the cause of the "putting on of Christ" in the only sense that needs to be considered. For v.[26] says, "*Ye are all sons of God, through faith*": accordingly baptism can only be the *occasion* on which one confesses his faith, not a sacrament. Should the expression "put on Christ" still appear remarkable, it would only be a matter of *expression*: the *thought* can be fully understood in the light of the fundamental ideas which Paul elsewhere expounds.

In 1 Th 4[13ff.] Paul combats (and therefore does not share) the fear of the Thessalonians that their dead would have no part in the future glory: the ground of their fear was certainly the expectation they had hitherto entertained, that no more persons would die before the end. These ideas of theirs might be explained by their conception of baptism only if baptism were mentioned here, or if it were at least proved from other evidence that baptism was expected to avert physical death. But it is obvious that no proof of this thesis has even been attempted; and to assume it without proof is unwarrantable. And, to mention one other matter, it is impossible to point to any analogous ideas in paganism with which this alleged Christian belief could be connected.

Again, in 1 Co 6[11] "*Ye were washed, ye were sanctified, ye were justified*," etc., there is at least no express mention of baptism. But if any one insists on an implicit reference—particularly in view of the expression *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*—it is not said how baptism produces the result spoken of. The passage by itself, therefore, can prove nothing, but is to be interpreted in the light of other and clearer passages.

But it is supposed that such a passage can be found in the tenth chapter of the same Epistle. And, in fact, when Paul there says (v.[1ff.]): "*Our fathers were all under the cloud,*

[1] Heitmüller, *Im Namen*, 320, *Taufe*, 10 f., who maintains this view, takes *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* not with *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, but by itself. But that is certainly not the most obvious interpretation: indeed one must not say that it is this incidental qualification that is substantiated by v.[27]. V.[27] must be intended to establish the main thesis of v.[26], viz. *πάντες υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ἐστε*.

and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them: and the rock was Christ"—he is thinking partly of Christian baptism. For though a similar enumeration of some of these tokens of God's grace to Israel in the wilderness is to be found in Ps $105^{39ff.}$, Wis $10^{17f.}$ 19^{7}, the summary of them here, and particularly the description (in view of v.[1] a superfluous description) of their being under the cloud and of their passage through the sea as a *baptism unto Moses*, is to be explained only by reference to the Christian usage. But this by no means implies that Paul, either in regard to baptism, or primarily in regard to the Lord's Supper—for it is only in reference to the latter that anything definite can be drawn from this passage—held any such view, *i.e.* that he regarded it as participation in a *πνευματικὸν βρῶμα* and *πόμα*. These expressions may be fully explained by the Old Testament or Jewish thought: manna is called also in Ps $78^{24f.}$ 105^{40}, Wis 16^{20} *ἄρτος οὐρανοῦ*, or *ἀγγέλων*, or again *ἀγγέλων τροφή*: and Philo interprets "the rock" as Wisdom (*Leg. Alleg.* ii. 21, cp. also *Quod Det. Pot. Ins. Sol.* 31, ed. Mangey, i. 82, 213).[1] When Heitmüller[2] discovers in the corresponding remark of Paul the view that Christ in the Lord's Supper is administered to His own, he is abruptly substituting for "drinking of Christ" (the source) the idea of "drinking Christ" (the element). But, more than this, he is, without explicit argument, connecting statements regarding Old Testament events with Christian usages: and since those statements can more naturally be otherwise explained,

[1] Von Dobschütz, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 11, thinks rather of the Rabbinical and Alexandrian interpretation of the manna and the water from the rock as being the Law or the Logos: but one thing above all tells against this view, viz. the expression which Paul uses, *ἔπινον ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας*. On the other hand, it is certainly correct to say that Paul would here show how the divine means of salvation do *not* operate infallibly. But that they were in his opinion infallible in their operation, even von Dobschütz's opponents probably do not maintain. Lietzmann, *Handbuch*, iii. 29, even supposes that Paul here *combated* a purely magical conception of the effect of baptism; but of this certainly there is nothing here at all.

[2] *Taufe*, 24 f.; also *Die Religion*, i. 40 f.

this procedure is hermeneutically and historically unwarranted. At any rate, 1 Co $10^{3f.}$ will not prove that Paul held a sacramental view of the Lord's Supper: one must not, therefore, in the first instance at least, postulate for him a similar view of baptism.

Nor does it follow from 12^{13}, "*In one Spirit were we all baptized into one body . . . and were all made to drink of one Spirit*," that the Spirit was communicated by means of baptism: on the contrary, if this ποτισθῆναι is appended to the βαπτισθῆναι, it seems to be distinguished from it. And even if that should not be granted, still the passage would not necessarily imply that baptism as such, as sacrament, had this effect—it might mean that it was rather the ceremony which accompanies the act of full admission to the Church.

But how does the case stand with 15^{29}, "*Else, what shall they do which are baptized* [*in substitution*] *for the dead?*" for that is the only possible translation. Is it not presupposed that baptism is magical to this extent, that one may have it administered to oneself in place of another? Certainly. But we have here to do primarily with a notion of the Corinthians, or of some Corinthians, for the view ought not to be perpetually restated that Paul could not have argued *en passant* from such a notion without necessarily approving of it.[1] Does he not say also in 1 Th 5^{7}, when commending sobriety to the children of the day, "*They that be drunken are drunken in the night*"? Does it follow that he regards such conduct as normal? No argument, therefore, regarding Paul's own view[2] can be drawn from 1 Co 15^{29}. How that belief of the Corinthians is to be explained, we shall see later: so far, we have no reason to suppose that the Apostle himself entertained similar ideas.

But we have not yet considered the main passage, Ro 6,

[1] I am glad that Heitmüller also (*Taufe u. Abendmahl im Urchristentum*, 1911, 84) has now come to the following conclusion: "In the particular case before us, Paul can hardly have agreed with the Church."

[2] Loisy (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 1909, lx. 374) remarks on this argument: "Les deux cas sont différents. Dans le second, Paul s'empresse de conclure: 'Nous qui sommes du jour, soyons sobre.' Par conséquent il blâme ceux qui s'enivrent et ne se borne pas à constater un fait." But he blames only those who become intoxicated in the daytime.

which is usually taken as the starting-point; only, it should have been examined for this purpose somewhat more carefully than has generally been done by the theologians and scholars who write on religious-historical subjects.

From Paul's aphorism in Ro 5^{20} "*Where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly*," some would draw the conclusion (6^{1}), "*Therefore we shall continue in sin, that grace may abound.*" Paul repels this conclusion by saying (v.^{2}) that we are dead to sin. Then he proceeds: "*Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death.*" This statement can certainly again be understood as though the effect spoken of (and it must, in the light of the previous context, be an ethical effect) were produced *by* baptism *itself*. But the reader is surprised that Paul, with no very apparent relevance, speaks at this point of the *death* of Christ. Are we to say that he has done this only in order to give it a new interpretation, viz. as our dying to sin? The οὖν of v.^{4} does not harmonize with this account. And further, it would not be natural that he should then proceed: "*That, like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life.*" The new life is surely nothing so very different from the dying to sin that it could be described as its purpose and result. And now once more in v.^{5} "*For if we have become united with him by the likeness of his death, we shall be also by the likeness of his resurrection*"—on the presupposition stated, does this not follow as a simple matter of course? Finally v.^{6} "*Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him,* IN ORDER THAT *the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin*"—would then be quite unintelligible: for in the phrases "crucified with him," "done away," "no longer in bondage to sin," distinction would be drawn in what is really homogeneous and identical, part of it being described as cause and part as effect. Jülicher[1] has very ingeniously explained this slow and puzzling advance in the Apostle's thought as due to a certain feeling of embarrassment: on the lofty summit of 5^{14-21}, which knows

[1] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 2. 34.

nothing of intermediate processes or transition-stages between "formerly" and "now," he has not laid his hand upon the key to the problem, viz. that man is granted the period of his earthly life for the renewal of his moral nature. But if Paul admittedly uses nowhere else so many words in regard to the same matter, should not his prolixity in these verses raise doubts against this whole interpretation of $6^{3ff.}$?

I should think that v.[7] would certainly open every one's eyes to the ineptitude of this interpretation. For when the passage continues, "For *he that hath died is justified from sin*," one would be bound, in view of what has preceded, to understand this "died" also in the ethical sense. But in that case the γάρ is not appropriate: for our freedom from bondage to sin would be grounded on the circumstance that our old man has been in the ethical sense crucified with Christ. Or if it should be supposed that here still another reason or basis is offered, the thought that he who has died to sin is justified, would be absolutely un-Pauline. Thus the real view of the Apostle appears to be the following: he who has suffered death (even if it is only in the person of another, and here, of course, in the person of Christ) is justified. *Then* we have here a real basis for the idea that the crucifixion of our old man with Christ, *i.e.* the atonement for his sins, should lead to the doing away of the body of sin and liberation from its bondage. All that is needed (as further also in $8^{3f.}$) is to fill in the intermediate ideas, thus—that he whose sins are forgiven can really begin a new life: in his struggle with the flesh he is not always impeded by the thought that it is utterly useless, seeing that the old guilt cleaves to him: he has recognized God as Love, and in so doing has understood also the purpose of His commands to us. And what precedes can also be understood from that standpoint: we are buried with Him through baptism into death and have become united with Him by the likeness of His death, inasmuch as His propitiatory death is for our advantage. Now we understand also why Paul in v.[3] speaks of this death of Christ, and how in v.[4] he can say that we are buried with Him *in order that* we may walk in newness of life: and even v.[5] makes good sense, our new life not being described (as it is primarily in

v.[4], where, of course, there are at the same time the beginnings of the other thought) as the consequence of our reconciliation, but as an analogue to the resurrection of Christ. And yet the whole treatment has something artificial or far-fetched. How is that to be explained?

Guided by many previous writers, I have on earlier occasions[1] shown that when Paul, in 1 Co 15[3f.], without suggestion from his proper theme, enumerates the chief items of his gospel and names them as death, burial, and resurrection, he is employing an established formula, probably a baptismal confession of faith. More recently, A. Seeberg,[2] von Dobschütz,[3] and Rendtorff[4] have expressed the view that this formula is employed also in Ro 6[3f.], and, in fact, the proposition there stated as self-evident, "*All we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death*," can find its explanation in this theory better than in the significance of the death of Christ for the thought of Paul. In particular, however, one then sees why the Apostle immediately speaks of "being buried with Christ," and (though it is only in v.[5] that he works out the thought fully) of Christ's resurrection. Since all this was in one's mind on the occasion of baptism, these references were for Paul and his readers perfectly natural: only the expression *σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν* might perhaps still cause surprise.

As Col 1[13] does not necessarily refer to baptism, the only passage that remains for discussion is 2[11ff.]: "*In Christ ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead. And you, being dead through your trespasses and the circumcision of your flesh, you, I say, did he quicken together with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses*," etc. Here the first words might

[1] "Die Anfänge eines Symbols im N.T.," *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 1895, 329 ff.; *Niedergefahren*, 86, 89, 101.

[2] *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, 1903, 52 ff.; *Die Taufe im N. T.*, 1905, 13 f.

[3] *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 27 f.

[4] *Taufe*, 48.

indeed be again understood as implying a magical effect of baptism: but the fact that it is compared with circumcision is an objection. For circumcision had *no* sacramental significance:[1] it was only the token that one belonged to the chosen people, and therefore Paul probably regarded baptism in the same way. It is faith which he names in v.[12] as the ground of our being raised with Christ (this again, like the "being buried," is probably mentioned because of some baptismal formula containing these details); and, finally, in v.[13] he bases it (viz. our being raised with Christ) on this, that God has forgiven us all our trespasses. In other words, as in Ro 6, so here also, the operation of baptism is based on the significance of the death of Christ:[2] there is in Paul's teaching no suggestion of a sacrament in the Catholic or even in the orthodox-Protestant sense. Certainly for him union with the Lord, the receiving of the Holy Spirit, renewal of life, the blotting out of sin, are experienced realities: certainly they are, in his eyes, connected with baptism: but this is explained by the circumstance that for Paul and his followers, conversion in general is a real turning round, a break with the past, the beginning of a new life, and that this conversion finds expression in baptism. It is therefore not only a symbol of something that *is* to happen, but on the other hand of a thing that *has* happened:[3] "what the candidate for baptism had experienced inwardly when he was subdued by the preaching of the gospel, and believed on Christ, he now declared publicly, the inward event of union with Christ being symbolically represented by baptism."[4] It is thus that we shall have to understand the formula *εἰς Χριστὸν βαπτίζειν*, not as meaning that the believer is thereby *made* to belong to Christ, but that he thereby *avows* that relationship.

Or, although it cannot be proved by any passage, must we

[1] Cp. Bousset, *Religion*, 227.

[2] So Althaus rightly says in his work, *Die Heilsbedeutung der Taufe im N. T.*, 1897, 164 ff., 192 ff.

[3] In this way I believe that I can reconcile with one another von Dobschütz's somewhat incomplete and inconsistent statements (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 4 ff.).

[4] Teichmann, "Die Taufe bei Paulus," *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1896, 365.

still on general grounds suppose that Paul viewed baptism as a sacrament? Heitmüller[1] writes on this point: "The πνεῦμα, this central idea of Pauline doctrine, is undoubtedly divine power, and for Paul, as for no other, the principle of his sublimest ethic; and still it is only conceivable as a divine, physico-hyperphysical substance, which, of course, is best communicated by a 'natural' [*naturhaftes*] medium. The εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ is ultimately to be conceived as a mystico-'natural' condition. Dying with Christ has an active mortifying of sin as its necessary consequence, but it is itself fundamentally a new creation—a transformation of moral principle, but a transformation such as one meets in nature—which results from the communication of the πνεῦμα. Sin is not to be separated from the σάρξ, and it is only when the σάρξ is abolished by the death of Christ that the dominion of sin is broken. In short, 'natural' and ethical pass into one another without any distinct boundary-line. But where this is so, we have the congenial soil, a veritable hotbed for the mysticism of the sacrament, the characteristic of which is the mingling of the spiritual-personal and the natural-sensuous." I believe that I have shown elsewhere[2] that Paul has a different conception of the relation between the σάρξ and sin, and, further, I cannot regard the foregoing interpretation of his doctrine of the Spirit and the exalted Christ as correct. Certainly, as Deissmann[3] has shown, the word ἐν in the formulae ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν πνεύματι, ἐν τῷ θεῷ, has a local significance: but it does not follow from this that Christ, the Spirit, God were regarded in a "natural" sense. And in that case the inference also disappears: indeed, there are some general considerations opposed to it which would be of no consequence if proofs of Paul's supposed estimate of baptism were really to be found, but which must be further considered if such an estimate is only postulated.

Heitmüller[4] himself points out that Paul has elsewhere a

[1] *Im Namen Jesu*, 326; more fully in *Taufe*, 18 ff.

[2] *Sünde*, i. 204 ff.

[3] *Die Formel: in Christo Jesu*, 1892, especially 97 f.

[4] *Taufe*, 17, 23, 36 f.; also "Noch einmal 'Sakrament u. Symbol im Urchristentum,'" *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 461.

purely spiritual and personal conception of that relationship between man and the Divine which religion implies. Is it probable, then, that he maintained such a "natural" view alongside of it?

Von Dobschütz[1] urges that Paul repeatedly describes the same experiences as are referred to in the passages discussed above, but without any allusion to baptism. If they were associated with baptism we should be forced to assume the same connexion in those other passages as well: as it is, those other passsages raise doubts against the whole theory.

Lastly, there is the remark in 1 Co $1^{14ff.}$ that Paul in Corinth baptized only a few persons, and none besides these. Certainly they were baptized, but Paul did not regard the performance of that rite as his appointed task. "Surely this is not in harmony with the high regard for baptism which we find in later times," says von Dobschütz,[2] again with justice.

As regards Paul, therefore, our final result is what we have ascertained above: no sacramental appraisement of baptism; only in the case of some Corinthians is such an estimate presupposed by him, and certainly in the crudest form. But how does the matter stand with the later New Testament writings?

In He 10^{22} Christians are said to have their hearts sprinkled (and thereby purified) from an evil conscience and their body washed with pure water. Certainly that refers to baptism: but it is only mentioned supplementarily as an external form: the important thing is the cleansing of the heart, which elsewhere is traced simply to the blood of Christ. Again, according to 1 P 3^{21} we are saved by baptism, which is the counterpart of the water of the deluge, not as the putting away of the filth of the flesh (as probably heathen scoffers declared), but as the appeal for a good conscience to God—accordingly once more nothing magical.[3] When, therefore, in 1 P 2^{2} Christians are described figuratively as new-born babes, this condition also is probably not regarded as

[1] *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 7 f. [2] *Ibid.* 9.

[3] So also Gunkel in J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 53: "It is noteworthy that the writer consequently thinks in the first instance not of the external action, but of the prayer as the most important part of the baptismal rite."

the effect of baptism itself: in 1^3 we have, on the contrary, the statement, "*He begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead*," and in 1^{23} "*through the word of God, which liveth and abideth.*" And since the Epistle to the Ephesians has affinities with the First Epistle of Peter, there also (Eph 5^{26}) the cleansing by the washing of water with the word must have been effected not by baptism, but simply by the word. Even the passage in the Epistle to Titus (3^5), "*God saved us through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost*," can, with all respect to F. Köhler,[1] be understood in the same way: at all events the thought is not clear. And so, too, if the term *νεόφυτος* in 1 Ti 3^6 was still at all understood as meaning "a new growth," one may explain it as one explains the *ἀρτιγέννητος* of 1 P 2^2. Finally, it is perhaps not unintentional when in the spurious ending of the Gospel of Mark (16^{16}) we read, "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*," but thereafter the modified expression, "*He that disbelieveth shall be condemned.*"

On the other hand, in Ac 2^{38}, as we have already seen, there is the injunction, "*Be baptized every one of you unto the remission of your sins*"; and so too in 22^{16}, "*Be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name.*" If the former passage proceeds thus, "*So shall ye receive the gift of the Holy Ghost*," we have to remark that in 10^{44} the bestowal of this gift is described as preceding baptism, but in $8^{15ff.}$ 19^6 as due to the laying on of the Apostles' hands. And that is probably the idea of the *auctor ad Theophilum*: accordingly *his* view of baptism, I admit, is undoubtedly sacramental.

The attitude of the Johannine literature to our question is peculiar. In Jn 3^5 Jesus says to Nicodemus, "*Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*"; but thereafter water is not again mentioned. There is no need on that account to follow Wendt,[2] Kirsopp Lake,[3] von Dobschütz,[4] Wellhausen,[5] and some others, in

[1] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 2. 197.
[2] *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1900, 112 f.
[3] *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the N.T.*, 1904, 15 ff.
[4] *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 6, 17.
[5] *Das Evangelium Johannis*, 1908, 18.

regarding the words ὕδατος καί as of later origin: it may be that the writer has attached no further importance to water. And, in fact, the narrative of the Washing of Feet in $13^{2ff.}$ points in that direction. Peter is reluctant to allow his feet to be washed by Jesus: Jesus answers him, "*If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.*" Thereupon Peter says, "*Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head*"; but Jesus replies, "*He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit.*" The dialogue does not harmonize with the usual symbolism of foot-washing, and accordingly von Dobschütz[1] would again excise v.$^{9f.}$. But this is hardly possible: v.^{8} is already leading up to it, and what follows starts from it. Further, John is always eager to give a new interpretation to a story which has been passed down to him. And in this case that new interpretation lies in connecting the washing of feet with baptism, as John understands it: to be washed *by Christ*, not the performance of the external act, is the important matter in John's eyes. And so one must also understand the remarkable statement in 19^{31}, to which the Evangelist attaches such significance that he appeals to the testimony of his favourite disciple, the statement, namely, that blood and water flowed from Jesus' side. With it again must be taken the passage in the First Epistle of John 5^{6}: "*This is he that came by water and blood . . . not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood.*" For the term "water" cannot mean the baptism of Jesus, which had no significance for those who opposed the teaching of the Epistle—the passage is clearly polemical—but must mean baptism in general; and of baptism it is declared that Jesus did not come with it alone, but at the same time with blood. "Blood," however, cannot refer to the Lord's Supper: for, in the first place, there should have been a mention of "the body"; and, secondly, such a reference would not fit the context: it refers therefore to the death which Jesus suffered.[2]

[1] *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 6, 17. I cannot here enter into a discussion of the more comprehensive theories of Schwartz, Wellhausen, and Spitta.

[2] Cp. Clemen, "Beiträge zum geschichtl. Verständnis der Johannesbriefe," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1905, 275 f. The views there expressed are in some degree corrected in the following discussion.

But when the passage proceeds, "*And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth*," this implies that the inner experience is ranked beside, in fact above, baptism and the atoning passion of Christ, which operate upon us. The next step in the argument, "*For there are three who bear witness, the Spirit, the water, and the blood: and the three agree in one*" (thus establishing the truth of the witness of the Spirit), owes its existence merely to the Jewish rule, "*At the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall a matter be established*" (Dt 19^{15}, 2 Co 13^{1}, Mt 18^{16}). But in that case, here also—and Jn 19^{34} is certainly to be understood in the same way—the Spirit is regarded as the decisive element, just as in Jn 3^{5} (although in another connexion). We do not require, therefore, with Wellhausen[1] and Heitmüller,[2] to explain $19^{31ff.}$, or with Scholten,[3] Baljon,[4] and perhaps H. Holtzmann,[5] 1 Jn $5^{7f.}$, as later insertions: but we may from all these passages infer the view of the man who was probably the one and identical author of both writings. But that view is, as Baumgarten[6] also has clearly shown for the First Epistle of John, *not sacramental*: it was only in the circles which the writer is addressing that baptism was so regarded. We have shown also that this sacramental view is found in the Acts of the Apostles, and was held in a particularly crude form by certain Corinthians. The question therefore arises, Whence did it proceed if it was not present elsewhere in primitive Christianity, or even in Jewish thought?

One might, in the first place, think of Paul's expositions of the subject which we have already discussed, or of similar expositions which he or others may have given on other occasions; and one might suppose that, as till this very day these are frequently understood in a sacramental sense, they were understood in the same way in earlier times. "Word and formula," says Reitzenstein[7] at one point, "have a com-

[1] *Erweiterungen u. Änderungen im vierten Evangelium*, 1907, 27 ff.
[2] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 306 f.
[3] *Het evangelie naar Johannes*, 1864, 17, n. 1.
[4] Finally, *Commentaar op de katholieke brieven*, 1904, 249 f.
[5] *Handkommentar zum N.T.* iv. 236.
[6] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 344.
[7] *Poimandres*, 247.

pulsion of their own, which becomes stronger as time goes on, and as doctrine gradually takes shape"; and Bittlinger[1] by numerous examples shows how religious conceptions of the Israelitish and Christian religion have been materialized. But if this is to happen, there must always be in existence a certain tendency towards such ideas: there must, in the case before us, have existed somewhere in the environment of early Christianity the belief in sacramental cleansings. Can we prove that such a belief existed?

Zimmern[2] raises the question whether the baptism of John is connected, as a last offshoot, with the water-rites of the Eridu cult. That hypothesis is excluded by what has been shown above (p. 212 f.): but there remains a possibility that Babylonian rites of cleansing had influenced the later *Christian* view of baptism. And yet, as in the case of Parsic cleansings, that influence could have been transmitted only through the medium of Judaism—but in Judaism, as we have found, there is no more trace of such a view in later times—or through another system of religion with which Christianity might really in later times have come into contact.

Such a system would be found in Mandaeism, by which accordingly even Brandt[3] thinks that the baptismal usage of Christianity has been influenced. Mandaean usage in baptism was not derived from Christian, but is connected with Babylonian usage, as is also the practice observed by other sects which we subsequently find in the same neighbourhood.[4] And yet, of course, neither Mandaean nor any other possible views, which we may perhaps suppose to have existed as early as the first century, can have occasioned

[1] *Die Materialisierung religiöser Vorstellungen*, 1905.

[2] *Keilinschriften*, 361. Also Wernle, *Anfänge*, 93, says of Christian baptism: "Its immediate precursor is the baptism of John: beyond that it goes back to the sacramental cleansings which began in later Judaic times to be adopted from Babylon." [The German text of Wernle's work has probably been greatly altered since the publication of the English edition, where the reference seems to be i. 132.—Tr.] A similar declaration by Kessler will be quoted on p. 264, n. 2 below.

[3] *Mand. Rel.* vi.

[4] Cp. *ibid.* 66 f., 177 ff.,—in part to be corrected in the light of Anz, *Texte u. Unters.* xv. 4. 98 ff.; of Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 359, n. 2; and of Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, 150 ff., 280 ff.

e.g. that belief in the magical virtue of baptism which we found in Corinth: we must therefore search for another provenance.[1]

Most scholars (particularly Dieterich [2] and Lietzmann [3]) think, therefore, of the Mysteries, so widely spread at that time in their various forms throughout Asia Minor and Greece. In the Mysteries, alongside of other ceremonies, we find rites of ablution, from which a new birth was expected. "*Et sacris quibusdam per lavacrum initiantur*," says Tertullian (*De Bapt.* 5), "*. . . certe ludis Apollinaribus et Eleusiniis tinguntur idque se in regenerationem et impunitatem periuriorum suorum agere praesumunt.*" In the Mysteries, too, some mention was made of "dying" in the figurative sense: as the high priest of Isis says in Apuleius (*Metam.* xi. 21): "*Traditionem ad instar voluntariae mortis et precariae salutis celebrari.*" [4] And, finally, both of these ideas were thought of as shadowed forth by the fortune of the particular god—at all events Firmicus Maternus (*De Err. Prof. Rel.* 22) relates that after the wailing for his death the priest applied a salve to the throats of the lamenting company and then murmured slowly:

> θαρρεῖτε μύσται τοῦ θεοῦ σεσωσμένου·
> ἔσται γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐκ πόνων σωτηρία.[5]

Thus one may, indeed one must, trace the Corinthian custom of being baptized for the dead to such heathen influences. There is distinct evidence of a similar belief, not in regard to the Mysteries, but in regard to the rites of other

[1] Still it is noteworthy that, as Anz, *Texte u. Unters.* xv. 4. 73, n. 1, says, "according to Mandaean teaching one can also make the 'ascent' easier for others, even for the dead."

[2] *Mithrasliturgie*, 157 ff. [3] *Handbuch*, iii. 30 f.

[4] For details, see also Hepding, *Attis, seine Mythen u. sein Kult*, 1903, 194 ff. The *Vita Commodi*, 9, contains a statement that Commodus had polluted the festival of Mithras by an actual murder; and probably we must conclude from this (with Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, ²1900, iii. 445, and Dieterich, *Mithrasliturgie*, 164 f.) that a *simulata occisio* formed part of the celebration, and that it was intended not only to alarm and test the mystes, but also to symbolize his spiritual regeneration.

[5] But the Egyptian parallels adduced by Gunkel, *Verständnis*, 84 f., have in some cases no connexion with mystery-cults.

cults: for example, Plato (*Rep.* ii. 364 B ff.) tells of priests who declared that they could offer sacrifices even on behalf of the dead.[1] And the Mysteries are particularly suggested by the circumstance that that baptism for the dead was supposed to assure their immortality—the all-important theme of the Mysteries as we know them.

For this very reason, however, it is more hazardous to derive from the same source the view current in those circles with which John appears to be dealing, and which possibly looked for some different result from baptism. Yet moral as well as other effects were attributed to the Mysteries: that has certainly been established by Dieterich[2] and Wobbermin[3] as against Rohde[4] and Anrich.[5] Indeed, whether it was John himself or those circles known to him that first used the expression, even the *ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι* of Jn 3[3. 7] might be derived from that source: at all events, in the Naassenic sermon of which we have spoken above (p. 155), mention is made of a *πνευματική*, *ἐπουράνιος*, *ἄνω γένεσις*, and the context shows that the reference is to the Eleusinian Mysteries.

On the other hand, *forgiveness of sins*, as it is regarded in the Acts of the Apostles, *i.e.* as something obtained through a rite like baptism, was probably not expected from the Mysteries: "the tremendous seriousness with which guilt and atonement are preached," says an authority so discerning as Reitzenstein,[6] "is, so far as I can discover, lacking in Hellenism." In this respect, therefore, the heathen belief in purifications has exercised only a *general* influence: the *special* form of the belief belongs exclusively to Christianity.

[1] Cp. also *Fragm. Orph.* 208. It is not proved that the taurobolia, which we shall discuss on a later page, were sacrifices on behalf of the dead.

[2] *Nekyia*, 66 f., 165.

[3] *Religionsgeschichtl. Studien*, 1896, 35 ff.; cp. also Cumont, *Religions*, 251.

[4] *Psyche*, i. 298 ff., 307 ff., ii. 71 ff.

[5] *Mysterienwesen*, 25 ff.; cp. also Lietzmann, *Handbuch*, iii. 121: "Though we are assured by many witnesses that ethical demands played an occasional part, and though Rohde is too one-sided in his treatment of the question, still this scholar is undoubtedly right in characterizing the fundamental mood of the mystae in the words of Diogenes the Cynic: *κρείττονα μοῖραν ἕξει Παταικίων ὁ κλέπτης ἀποθανὼν ἢ Ἐπαμεινώνδας, ὅτι μεμύηται* (Plut. *Quom. Adol. Poet. Aud. Deb.* 4)."

[6] *Poimandres*, 180, n. 1.

As for the Pauline statements regarding the moral transformation that is typified in baptism, or again the parallel drawn between it and the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, there is still less reason for explaining them by foreign influences. Only the expressions "*Ye put on Christ*" (Gal 3^{27}), and "*We have become united with Christ*" (Ro 6^{5}), which I have already described as perhaps surprising, might ultimately be traced to the belief—which was probably no longer held even in regard to the Mysteries in general—that the participant in the rites is physically united with the deity. But it is quite unjustifiable to suppose, with Dieterich,[1] that this idea affected Paul's view of baptism: one argument against it is the fact to which von Dobschütz [2] calls attention, that these particular expositions belong to Paul exclusively, and have no further influence. Still less is it possible to make out a correspondence between the Synoptic *μετάνοια*, or even between the words *σήμερόν σε γεγέννηκα* (an attested variant in Lk 3^{22} of the utterance from heaven at Jesus' baptism), and the new birth effected by the initiatory rites of the Mysteries. As we have already seen (p. 43), the term *μετάνοια* was in that age understood in the sense of "repentance"; further, it originally denoted a change of mind in the active rather than in the passive sense; and, finally, the utterance at Jesus' baptism, "*Thou art my beloved Son*" (Mk 1^{11}, Lk 3^{22}), refers to Him merely as the Messiah, not in any way as one born anew.

On the other hand, the view that Paul *might* have borrowed from the language of the Mysteries the *expressions* *ἐνδύεσθαι* and *σύμφυτον γίνεσθαι*, perhaps gains in probability from the fact that other expressions in his writings seem to have this or a similar origin. When, for example, in Gal 6^{17} he speaks (probably) of scars which he had received in the course of his ministry, as being brandmarks (*στίγματα*) of Jesus which he bears on his body, this might allude to the custom (already presupposed in Is 44^{5}) of tattooing oneself in honour of a god.[3] Still clearer refer-

[1] *Mithrasliturgie*, 176 f. [2] *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 23.

[3] Cp. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 265 ff. [*Bible Studies*, 349 ff.], *Licht vom*

ences to such a practice are to be found in Rev $13^{16f.}$ $14^{9.\ 11}$ 16^{2} 19^{20} 20^{4}—where we are told that the beast will cause all men to be marked on the right hand or on the forehead with his name or the number of his name. Further, *παραδιδόναι* and *παραλαμβάνειν*, as well as *ἄρρητα ῥήματα*, are terms derived from the Mysteries; and the same is, I think, ultimately true of *τέλειος* and *σφραγίζεσθαι*,[1] although Paul may have borrowed these in the first instance from Judaism. But the comparison of the body laid in the grave with the grain of wheat, 1 Co 15^{37} (and Jn 12^{24}), does not necessarily come from the Eleusinian rites, nor, as we have already seen (p. 174), from Parsism. One may, however, with better reason derive partially and collaterally from the Mysteries the designation of Paul as father, and of the members of the Church as his sons or children, and of all of them together as brethren:[2] but in all these cases it is only a matter of phraseology or the form of an idea: the idea itself has not been borrowed.

Yet Paul's views would have shown the influence of ethnical beliefs, if the naming of Jesus' name, which perhaps, according to 1 Co 6^{11}, accompanied the ceremony of baptism —for that is the meaning of the formula *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*—had had an exorcistic purpose. That it had such a purpose, Heitmüller[3] affirms, on the basis partly of this passage, partly of other passages in the New Testament where this or a similar formula appears: we must therefore try to discover in what sense the formula is used. But in so doing it is better to set our face in the opposite direction from Heitmüller, and begin not with the later, but with the earliest passages.

First we hear in Mk $9^{38f.}$, Lk 9^{49} of one who "in the name" of Jesus cast out devils without attaching himself to

Osten, 218 [Eng. trans. 345]; Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 238, n. 2; Hepding, *Attis*, 162 f.; Gruppe, *Mythologie*, 1545, n. 3. But it is not certain that Paul also pays regard to the original intention of this practice.

[1] Cp., finally, H. Holtzmann, *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1904, 64; Gruppe, *Mythologie*, 1616, n. 1. In regard to the term *φωτισμός*, 2 Co $4^{4.\ 6}$, cp., further, p. 345 below.

[2] Cp. Dieterich, *Mithrasliturgie*, 146 ff.; Lietzmann, *Handbuch*, iii. 98.

[3] *Im Namen Jesu*, 232 ff.

the disciples.[1] This implies that he actually attributed a magical effect to this name—but *he* was a Jew. Again, in Lk 10^{17} the Seventy certainly say, "*Lord, even the devils are subject unto us in thy name*"; but this saying is probably just as unhistorical as the account of their commission. When, further, in Mt 7^{22} the warning is put into Jesus' own mouth, "*Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out devils, and by thy name do many mighty works?*"—the divergent and more trustworthy form which appears in Luke (13^{26}) probably shows that He did not use this language. In the same way the saying in Mk $16^{17f.}$ is, of course, unhistorical: "*In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall in no wise hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.*" No doubt these various sayings are interesting evidences of later ideas: but the theory, which Heitmüller[2] thinks possible, that Jesus Himself attributed magical effects to His name, cannot be proved or even be made plausible (by His belief in daemons), and, further, it is totally inconsistent with the view He expressed of the relation in which He or man in general stood to God.

Nor will any one think of exorcism or magic when Paul writes in 2 Th 3^{6}: "*We command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly.*" If, then, in 1 Co $5^{3f.}$ he says with reference to the *incestuosus*: ἤδη κέκρικα ὡς παρὼν τὸν οὕτως τοῦτο κατεργασάμενον ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ κτλ., it is almost certainly more correct to take the words ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ past συναχθέντων—Ἰησοῦ and attach them to παραδοῦναι: for with συναχθέντων we have already σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ: and if one makes Paul interrupt himself with συναχθέντων, one understands better the iteration of the

[1] Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 187, n. 3, is doubtful of the historicity of this passage, but certainly without grounds.

[2] *Im Namen Jesu*, 241.

object of the verb *παραδοῦναι*. But even then it does not follow that a magical virtue is attributed to the name of Jesus: how the expression *παραδοῦναι τῷ σατανᾷ* is itself to be understood, we shall see later.

Again, in 6^{11}, a passage already twice mentioned, the phrase *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* is not necessarily to be taken in the same sense as *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν*, *i.e.* as referring to an "objective factor": indeed, such an explanation would be quite impossible for a passage like Col 3^{17}: "*Whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him.*" And must we really understand Ph 2^{10} "*That in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth,*" in this sense, that when the name which is above every name is pronounced, it forces all living beings, willingly or unwillingly, to their knees, and to a glad or reluctant acknowledgment of Jesus as Lord? To support this interpretation, Heitmüller[1] cites 1 Co $2^{6.8}$ 15^{24}, Col 2^{15}, and says that, according to these passages, for many groups in the world of spirits—and it is of that world that one must certainly think—subjection to Christ would be precisely such a matter of compulsion. But in that case should it not have been stated on what occasion these reluctant angelic powers would be forced to bow before Jesus? In fact, could the Apostle have proceeded, "*and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father*"? Thus Paul's writings also furnish no proof that he believed in the magical virtue of the name of Jesus.

Even the passages already mentioned, Mt 7^{22}, Mk 16^{17}, do not contain such a belief: for how is the name of Jesus to cause prophesying and speaking with tongues? Heitmüller[2] declares it to be "extremely probable that the pronouncing or invocation of the name of Jesus when these eminently spiritual phenomena occur . . . has as its ultimate basis the thought that one is thereby 'filled with the Spirit,' that the Spirit of Jesus is thereby made to descend"—but if we are to suppose that the invocation of the name of Jesus

[1] *Im Namen Jesu*, 67 f. [2] *Ibid.* 247.

caused these phenomena, it was surely bound to *precede* them, and that is nowhere stated.

When we come to the writings of Luke, his Gospel 10^{17}, and Ac $3^{6.\ 16}$ $4^{7.\ 10}$ 16^{18}, the case is different. Particularly when in Ac 4^{10} it is said: "*Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even in this name doth this man stand here before you whole*": here we have, I think, in point of fact a magical effect attributed to this name. But how far this is from being universally true, even in the Acts of the Apostles, is shown by the passages in which there is mention of speaking and teaching in His name ($4^{17f.}$ $5^{28.\ 40}$ $9^{27f.}$).

And still less is it possible to give this explanation to prayer in the name of Jesus, Jn $14^{13f.}$ 15^{16} $16^{24.\ 26}$. When Heitmüller,[1] in support of this interpretation of the formula (primarily as it appears in the first of these passages), urges that previously there was mention of miracles which the disciples were to be able to perform, and that these were performed through the power of Jesus' name, the argument is inconclusive: indeed it is altogether inconceivable that John should have believed that God or even Christ Himself might be constrained through the pronouncing of His name to listen to an entreaty. And how does this interpretation of the formula agree with 20^{31} "*that believing ye may have life in his name*"?—by believing, not by pronouncing His name! Even the direction given in James ($5^{14f.}$): "*Is any among you sick? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord,*" is followed by the words, "*and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick*"; there is therefore no suggestion of a sacrament of unction, such as is found elsewhere.[2] Further, one will discover only a few traces in the New Testament of a superstitious regard for names. In Mk 5^{9}, Lk 8^{30}—the historicity of the statement is negligible—when Jesus questions the demoniac of Gerasa regarding his name,

[1] *Im Namen Jesu*, 79 f.; cp. J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 285, where, further, 14^{14} is declared to be spurious.

[2] Cp. Bousset, *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1901, 139, n. 2; *Hauptprobleme*, 297 ff.

Wellhausen[1] and J. Weiss[2] offer the explanation that any one who knows the name of a spirit has thereby power over him; but there is nothing in the narrative that points to this. Still less can we, with Giesebrecht,[3] explain the name which from Ac 13^9 onwards is borne by Paul, as due to some particular esteem in which it was held: it is probable that from the very first Paul not only bore it in actual fact, but that he was also so designated in the original source here drawn upon. The new name, however, which "he that overcometh" is to receive (Rev 2^{17}), has, of course, a special meaning, like the names which are to be written upon him (Rev 3^{12}),[4] and those with which the chosen are marked (7^3 9^4 14^1), or those with which the worshippers of the beast are branded ($13^{16f.}$ 14^9 19^{20}).[5]

This belief in names which we find in the writings of Luke and in the Apocalypse[6] must certainly, like the belief entertained by Jews of that time, be derived from paganism, particularly from Babylonia and Egypt:[7] for Old Testament ideas are not enough to account for it.[8] In the matter of names, therefore, the Old Testament belief and the ancient belief in general have left some after-effects in the New Testament; but, in the ceremony of baptism, the pronouncing of the name of Jesus, and (at a later time) of the names of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, has this significance only,

[1] *Das Evangelium Marci*, 1903, 41. [2] *Die Schriften*, i. 1. 110.

[3] *Die alttest. Schätzung des Gottesnamens u. ihre religionsgeschichtl. Grundlage*, 1901, 10, n. 1, 102.

[4] Cp. also Bousset, *Offenbarung*, 230: "Finally, one Greek cult-usage may be cited in elucidation of our passage. It was the custom that the priest in charge of the cult of the Emperor in a province should, at the close of his year of office, set up his statue in the precincts of the temple, and record on it his own and his father's name, his place of residence, and the date of his term of office."

[5] In reference to this and to "the wine of the wrath of God, the mixed and the unmixed," Rev 14^{10} (which is perhaps so described for the reason which will be mentioned on p. 263 below), there are no sufficient grounds for thinking especially of the Mithraic Mysteries, as O. Pfleiderer does, *Christusbild*, 87, n. 1 [Eng. trans. 129, n. 1].

[6] Brandt takes a similar view, *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1904, 2342.

[7] Cp. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 132 ff., 185 ff.

[8] Cp. Giesebrecht, *Schätzung*, 86; also Farnell, *The Evolution of Religion*, 1905, 183 ff.

that it indicates to whom the baptized person will thenceforward adhere.[1] And so, even along this line of argument, the theory of a magical virtue in baptism cannot be proved.

c. The Lord's Supper.

If hitherto we have required to pay merely occasional heed to textual questions, we must now make them our starting-point in examining the Lord's Supper as it appears in primitive Christianity, and, in the first place, the accounts of its institution. For though it is unimportant whether Mk 14^{24} and Mt 26^{28} speak of the blood of the *new covenant* or only of the blood of the *covenant*, it is by no means unimportant whether in Luke's account the original reading is the longer one offered by our editions, or the shorter one ending 22^{19} *τὸ σῶμά μου* or (without *διδόμενον*) *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*. This question, however, can hardly be settled at this point. For there is no special force in the argument that the shorter reading is not well attested, and that the Third Evangelist must have known the more detailed account given by Paul in 1 Co $11^{23ff.}$: if, on the other hand, Lk 22^{16} and ^{18} correspond, and again 22^{15} and ^{17}, one need not conclude that still another pair of parallel verses must have followed. We must therefore for the present leave the question open; but we may assume, as we have just done, the genuineness of the Pauline account of the Lord's Supper. And there, in the "words for the bread," ℵ*A B C*, some minuscule manuscripts, and some of the Fathers read only *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, most of the authorities read besides this *κλώμενον*, D* *θρυπτόμενον*, the Sahidic, Coptic, and Armenian translations have *διδόμενον*. Probably the first of these is the original reading: the difference of the participles shows that originally there was none present.

If we turn now to the question of the meaning of the words of institution, there can, in the first place, be no doubt as to the general sense in Matthew and Mark. The blood is that which is shed for many; accordingly the body, which is not more definitely described, is the body given to death.

[1] Cp. also Merx, *Evangelien*, ii. 1. 39 f.

How far wine (or properly a cup) and bread correspond to these in the view of the Evangelists, cannot *here* at all events be decided with absolute certainty.

The same remarks would *pro tanto* apply to Luke's account, if it went no farther than 22^{19} (with the omissions already described), and if, therefore, bread alone were spoken of. On the other hand, if the longer reading is the original one, and if it is there said of the cup (v.^{20}), *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον*, the last words must properly, of course, be referred to *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον*, not to *ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου*, *i.e.* the cup (or its contents) would be described as poured out for the disciples. However, that is not the way in which even the Evangelist, the person with whom we have primarily to do (or, if the verse is regarded as spurious, the interpolator) can have taken the participle. For even if it were conceivable that, early in the history of the observance, part of the contents of the cup was poured out[1] [for that is how we should have to understand the phrase; nor must we forget that Luke says nothing of "part"], still the words *ὑμὲρ ὑμῶν* would at all events not suit *that* interpretation; for *the wine* would certainly not have been poured out for the disciples or believers. But, further, it is impossible to suppose, with O. Holtzmann,[2] that Jesus Himself poured out the contents of the last cup, and described this wine as His blood of the covenant, which on the occasion of this, its fresh ratification, was to take the place of the blood that was shed when the covenant was first concluded. For in that case we should have to suppose that Jesus sprinkled at any rate His disciples with the "blood," as Moses did the Israelites (Ex 24^{8}): otherwise the symbol would be quite unintelligible

[1] Rénaudot [see Götz, *Die heutige Abendmahlsfrage* (1904), ^{2}1907, 189, n. 1] says: "Monent Gabriel Alexandrinus patriarcha et alii, ut 'eo loco sacerdos calicem leviter inclinet ad effusionem sanguinis Christi significandam.'" But that is a different matter, and, besides, the notice is too late. The fact that nothing of this sort is known at an earlier time is not explained by the fear which men felt (and Tertullian, *De Cor. Mil.* 3, is evidence of this) lest even a drop should be spilt from the cup: on the contrary, were the hypothesis correct, such a feeling would never have arisen.

[2] *Leben Jesu*, 1901, 363; *War Jesus Ekstatiker?* 1903, 109 ff.; "Das Abendmahl im Urchristentum," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1904, 102 f.

and meaningless: but such a sprinkling is not a complete equivalent of "pouring out." Further, we should have to suppose that Jesus gave to the breaking of bread—which is by itself quite intelligible—a particular meaning and a remote connexion with His death; but that He probably did not divide it among them. And, finally, the origin of the other and later conception of the Lord's Supper would remain a hopeless enigma. No, the words "shed for you" certainly, even in Luke, refer to the blood: for if the word "blood" is grammatically in another case, that is explained simply by the fact that the Evangelist or interpolator is partly dependent on Paul, partly on Mark. Thus even the words for the cup in Lk 22^{20} refer to the blood shed in dying, as the words for the bread refer to the body given to death.[1] But are those words for the cup authentic, and can the reports which the Evangelists and Paul give of Jesus' last supper be regarded as historical?

As we all know, Paul opens his account in 1 Co 11^{23} with the words *ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν.* Many exegetes would understand this "received"—particularly in view of the emphatic *ἐγώ* preceding it—of a revelation imparted to the Apostle: but

1. in that case, instead of *ἀπό* we should have *παρά*, especially as that is a more natural word to follow *παρέλαβον*:

2. the passage in 15^{3} *παρέδωκα ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν κτλ.*,[2] though it lacks *ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου*, is still a parallel to this; and *it* certainly contains no suggestion of a revelation:

3. such a revelation would not, I think, have informed Paul of any incident which he could then incorporate in his description of Jesus' last hours.

The emphatic *ἐγώ* which precedes means only this: however much *you* appear to have forgotten the origin of the Lord's Supper, *I* have received the following account of it from the Lord. Thus *ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* is particularly import-

[1] Here also it is proposed by Götz, *Abendmahlsfrage*, 157, 188, to take *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον* with *τοῦτο*: but this interpretation has nothing to support it, and is altogether impossible.

[2] The genuineness of this passage also may, I think, be taken for granted.

ant for Paul: can we say that he traced something back to the Lord that did not at all go back to Him?

It is therefore impossible to suppose that Jesus celebrated the Lord's Supper with bread alone,[1] although an attempt has been made to prove this by special arguments. In their details also, these arguments will show themselves inconclusive.

O. Pfleiderer,[2] J. Weiss,[3] and Goguel[4] believe that, as the shorter text of Luke indicates, Jesus divided only *bread* among His disciples when instituting the Supper. In proof of this they appeal further to the expression "to break bread," which frequently occurs in the Acts of the Apostles ($2^{42.46}$ 20^{7}); but this is found also in Didache 14^{1}, where the Lord's Supper is celebrated with bread *and wine*, and so can prove nothing. And still less the words used incidentally[5] by Paul in 1 Co 10^{17} "*For as there is one bread, so we, who are many, are one body*"; for it is much more natural to see in this an interpretation of the Eucharistic bread suggested by Paul himself, and combined with his usual doctrine of the body of Christ, than an interpretation received by him from others. The fact that no similar explanation of the cup is given, although the cup was previously mentioned, is due simply to the impossibility of giving it a meaning that would correspond to the one "bread." One must

[1] The theory of van den Bergh van Eysinga (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1905, 244 ff.), which is apparently the contrary of this, does not fall to be examined here, because it deals with the cup (Lk $22^{17f.}$), which, according to this writer, is alone historical, not with the "breaking of bread" in the proper sense of the term.

[2] *Urchristentum*, i. 682 ff. [Eng. trans. ii. 490 ff.]; *Christusbild*, 88 f. [Eng. trans. 130 f.].

[3] *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (1892), ²1902, 198 f.; *Die Schriften*, i. 1. 470 f. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, 305 ff., cites the Clementine literature and the Acta Thomae, but afterwards says only (p. 309): "One must for the present defer the question, what conclusions for the primitive history of the Christian Supper can be deduced from this information, viz. that among the Gnostic-Christian sects the custom of a solemn conjoint meal of brotherhood (with bread and salt) as an act of initiation was maintained quite independently of the Eucharist in the narrower sense of the term, and perhaps even without the Eucharist."

[4] *L'eucharistie. Ses origines à Justin martyr*, 1910, 86.

[5] They have therefore even been declared to be spurious, though unwarrantably.

not therefore conclude from this passage that Jesus "had made the common meal a symbol of the inner fellowship, the covenant of brotherhood, among His followers"[1]—an idea which, moreover, could certainly not be expressed by the four words "*This is my body.*" Indeed, we may here go one step farther, and as the only proofs from ancient times for a communion in one kind have not shown themselves conclusive, we may now say that the shorter reading in Luke's Gospel is probably not the original one, but that it has arisen through some erroneous curtailment of the longer. And this at the same time puts out of court all the attempts that have been made, from Gardner[2] to Butler,[3] to derive the breaking of bread (in the literal sense of the term) from the Eleusinian Mysteries.

But though Jesus must have celebrated the Lord's Supper in both kinds, still the details of what He said in regard to the bread and cup might possibly be different from what we find in the writings of the Evangelists and Paul. In the parallel to 1 Co 11^{23} already quoted, viz. 15^{3}, Paul certainly interpreted the expression "for our sins," which had been delivered to him, in another way than the early Church: it saw in Jesus' death *one* means, but Paul *the* means to the forgiveness of sins. Further, he, of course, understood *his* words for the cup, "*This cup is the new covenant in my blood*," and so, too, Matthew *his* words, "*This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many unto remission of sins*," and in fact even Mark and Luke understood *theirs*, all in a sense corresponding, *i.e.* a sense in which Jesus surely had not intended them. For as certainly as He foresaw His own violent death, He could not recognize in it *the* means or even *a* means of the forgiveness of sins, if He would not give the lie to His former preaching in its most essential point. But probably He was able, indeed He was bound, to see in His sufferings something more than merely His Father's will or a

[1] O. Pfleiderer, *Urchristentum*, i. 683 [Eng. trans. ii. 492].

[2] *The Lord's Supper*, 1893: in a different form in *Exploratio Evangelica*, 1899, 454 f.

[3] *Nineteenth Century*, 1905, lvii. 492 ff.; cp., on the other hand, Cheetham, *The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian*, 1897, 110 ff.

gateway to exaltation and a second coming—He was bound to see in it a service which He was rendering His brethren; and if once He did that, then in the hour when He was in full view of that death by which He foresaw that His disciples would be utterly overwhelmed, He *was bound* (if we may once more use this expression) to speak of it. And though, of course, He need not necessarily have spoken of it in the words for the bread and the wine, and in no others, still that is the only sense in which those words can be understoood.

For Jesus cannot have interpreted His last meeting with His disciples as an anticipation of the Messianic feast. That also, it is true, was figuratively described as a feeding upon the Messiah, but for that reason it could not be exhibited antecedently by actual eating. And it was as impossible for Jesus to compare bread and wine with His body and blood on the ground that both were, or were to be, broken or shed. For, in regard to the wine, it is not only not said, it is not only not to be supposed, that it was first poured into the cup: even if one would suppose this, such an infusion would be a very imperfect representation of the shedding of blood. The breaking of the bread, on the other hand, cannot, as I have already said (p. 240), be intended to represent the slaying of the body. For if the correspondence between breaking and slaying were even more adequate, the breaking of the bread, as has already been suggested, would be a means, not of its destruction, but, on the contrary, of its utilisation —as the cutting of bread is with us. Accordingly, though perhaps the Evangelists and Paul found something more in the breaking of the bread, and for that reason mentioned it specially, still for Jesus the similarity between bread and His body, wine and His blood, can have consisted only in this, that as bread and wine minister to the physical life of men, so His body and blood, as given up to death, minister to their spiritual life. Whether the words for the bread ran as they appear in Paul and Luke, or simply as in Mark and Matthew, cannot be decided; but we must regard the words for the cup, even in the more primitive form which they have in Mark, as a later and amplified statement.

For in the sentence *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης*

τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν there are two thoughts combined, which should have been expressed separately if they were to be made clear—the one, "This is my blood," and the other, "My blood is a blood of the covenant." But Jesus perhaps *did* express them separately [it is probable that the words for the bread were only "This is my body," but this is no counter-argument to the theory]: the combination of these in one sentence would therefore be the work of a later time. Nevertheless this supposition also has its difficulties.

Although Jesus' last supper was a celebration of the Passover, it was by no means an obvious thing on that account to describe His blood as blood of the covenant. For however natural one may think it to connect the Passover with the conclusion of a covenant, that was never done in the Old Testament or in Jewish thought. But perhaps Jesus had in His mind rather the conclusion of the covenant at Mount Sinai, or, to be even more precise, described the wine as His blood of the covenant because of Ex 24^8: as it was His own blood He thought of, He could probably so describe it without sprinkling His disciples with the wine. Yet this theory also is inadmissible.

Jesus from the first forgave sins, and to this extent, although He never used the expression so far as we know, He proclaimed a new covenant of God with men. Had He now described His impending death as the conclusion of a new covenant, He would again have contradicted His former preaching. But He could not interpret His death even as the sealing of a former covenant: for even if this idea had been a common one in Jewish thought, it was rather the *conclusion* of a covenant that was attended by the shedding of blood. Such a *conclusion*, however, Jesus could not proclaim, and therefore even on the occasion of the Supper He probably did not speak of a new covenant. If Justin has not this addition, although he speaks elsewhere of the new covenant, he has probably in fact preserved the utterance in its original form.

Lastly, Jesus' figurative mode of expressing the one thought which He wished to express, is, of course, partially explained by the Oriental predilection for this manner of speech. For Jews this particular comparison was a specially

natural one, because in their literature knowledge was likened to food. "*Wisdom*," says the son of Sirach (15[3]) "*shall feed him with bread of understanding, and give him water of wisdom to drink*": and the same writer puts into Wisdom's mouth the following saying (24[21]): "*They that eat me shall yet be hungry; and they that drink me shall yet be thirsty.*" Still, Jesus would hardly have chosen this figure if He had merely wished to give to His disciples, now assembled around Him for the last time, a lesson on the significance of His death: He had something further in view, He wished to establish a permanent custom. If we suppose this—in other words, if we regard an *institution* of the Lord's Supper as a historical fact—then we understand why Jesus employed that symbol, and why He chose precisely this: as often as His disciples reassembled in the same way, they were to recall His greatest act of love for them, or, as Paul expresses it (1 Co 11[26]), they were to "proclaim His death till He come."[1]

Thus not only the celebration of the Lord's Supper by Jesus but also its continued observance in the Church are fully explained without any thought of foreign influences. But what must be said now regarding the subsequent development?

As in the case of baptism, so here also, the majority of recent theologians—I name only O. Pfleiderer,[2] Anrich,[3] H. Holtzmann,[4] Harnack,[5] Hoffmann,[6] Heitmüller,[7] Weinel,[8] Wrede,[9] Bousset,[10] Lietzmann,[11] Stärk,[12] Goguel[13]—believe

[1] As Lietzmann (*Handbuch*, iii. 132 f.) and Heitmüller (*Die Religion*, i. 1909, 44) show, the Synoptic expression also reminds us of the terms of foundation of the ancient associations for worship; but this does not prove that the act of institution was itself unhistorical.

[2] *Urchristentum*, i. 297 ff., 333 [Eng. trans. i. 419 ff., 467]; *Christusbild*, 84 ff. [Eng. trans. 124 ff.].

[3] Cp. p. 216, n. 1 above.

[4] *Theologie*, ii. 181 ff.; *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1904, 58 ff.

[5] Cp. p. 216, n. 3 above.

[6] *Das Abendmahl im Urchristentum*, 1903, 14 ff.

[7] *Taufe*, 23 ff.; *Die Religion*, i. 38 ff.

[8] *Paulus*, 1904, 198 ff. [Eng. trans., *St. Paul, the Man and his Work*, 1906, 256 ff.].

[9] Cp. p. 216, n. 6 above.

[10] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 1. 102 ff., 111 f.

[11] *Handbuch*, iii. 123 ff., 133.

[12] *Zeitgeschichte*, ii. 119.

[13] *L'eucharistie*, 186 ff.

that it was Paul who originated the later and sacramental view. The symbolical conception,[1] it is true, is generally supposed to be present in 1 Co $11^{23ff.}$, and, in fact, any other explanation of this passage is quite impossible. Some would take the words *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον* with *τοῦτο*, and then understand *τὸ σῶμά μου* of the congregation, typified by the bread that is broken or consecrated for many; but the objections are that

(1) that reading, as we have already seen (p. 238), is probably not at all the original one:

(2) the expression *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον* could not be taken past *μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα* and connected with *τοῦτο*:

(3) we should probably require *ὑμῖν* instead of *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*: for here at least, after the words *εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν*, it is quite inconceivable that *κλώμενον* should mean consecrated: and finally,

(4) *σῶμά μου* cannot mean the Church; for by the blood we must certainly understand the shed blood—therefore also by the body we must understand not the mystical body, but the one given up to death.

So here, at all events, we are confronted by the symbolical view of the Lord's Supper, which, however, we must not describe, with Heitmüller,[2] as more a private and theological interpretation of the Apostle's; for if we disregard the change in the estimate of Jesus' death which we have discussed above (p. 242), this symbolical view is the original one, and probably the most widespread even in the later Church. If a different interpretation is found in other passages of the Pauline Epistles, the Apostle's thought contains an antinomy, which cannot be made less serious by emphasizing unimportant affinities, as Heitmüller does. The inner contradiction which would then be manifest in the thought of Paul makes one hesitate to believe that he held a sacramental view of the Lord's Supper. It is, of course, not inconceivable that he did: the whole question is whether that can be demonstrated.

[1] O. Pfleiderer, *Urchristentum*, i. 300 f. [Eng. trans. i. 422 f.], it is true, calls this also a sacramental view; but in doing this he uses the word in a different sense, for which one ought rather to employ another expression.

[2] *Taufe*, 30 f.; *Die Religion*, i. 40, 42.

That 1 Co $10^{3f.}$ proves nothing, we have already seen (p. 218 f.); indeed, as we have now ascertained that the alleged view of baptism is not present in Paul's teaching, we shall in the first instance regard it as improbable that he held such a view of the Lord's Supper. But what about the second half of the chapter? Is the sacramental view not really to be found there?

When in v.[16] we read, "*The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?*"— these words *can*, I admit, be understood in the sense that by partaking of bread and wine one enters into a real union with the body and blood of the glorified Christ. But to this there is the objection that Paul in 15^{50} says, "*Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,*" and that therefore, since he regards Christ as having been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of them that are asleep (v.[20]), he probably did not think of Him as possessing blood. One must accordingly say that he here distinguishes body and blood of Christ only because of the "words of institution": but one may still suppose that he thinks of an actual union with the exalted Christ.[1] However, since body and blood are really named, and they belong to the Jesus who walked upon earth and went to meet death, it is possible to understand by the expression "communion with body and blood" participation in (or even confession of) the saving significance of His death.[2]

[1] In that case, however, one must not justify the mention of body and blood, as Heitmüller, *Taufe*, 32, latterly does, by saying that Christ Himself is the sacrifice which produces or occasions the *communio*, and that we therefore partake of the body and blood of Christ. In this particular interpretation Christ is the exalted Christ, and *He* does not possess flesh and blood. Loisy (*Revue de l'hist. des rel.*, 1909, lx. 375) only repeats what I had already said.

[2] On the other hand, the two (!) interpretations which von Dobschütz (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 12 f.) gives of the expression in question are both impossible. According to him the genitives τοῦ σώματος and τοῦ αἵματος must, in the first place, denote the token, the symbol of the communion referred to: "the participants in the Lord's Supper [form] a 'Fellowship of the Body and Blood of Christ' in the same way as modern Catholicism speaks of Confraternities of the Rosary, of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and the like." But that is not at all the meaning of κοινωνία: and even if it were, it could not be said of the cup and the bread that they *are* such a fellowship. On the other hand, von Dobschütz says: "Christ claims from all who sit at His table a full and exclusive ac-

Only, in both these cases, and particularly in the latter case, we should then have to presuppose that the remarkable term κοινωνία had originally meant something more concrete, and that when Paul employed the term he followed that usage of speech, but really thought of the word in the modified sense. Which of these various explanations is the correct one, can only be shown as we proceed.

The first explanation (viz. actual union with the exalted Christ) is clearly out of harmony with what follows in v.[18]: "*Behold Israel after the flesh: have not they which eat the sacrifices communion with the altar*" (κοινωνοὶ . . . εἰσίν)? For with the altar one can *not* enter into real communion; and rashly to maintain (because of Rev 14[18] 16[7]) that altar means an angel of the altar, is, of course, unsound. And yet if, assuming the meaning first suggested for v.[16], we should look for such a thought as H. Holtzmann[1] expresses, viz. that the sacrificers entered into a mystic union with the god to whom the altar belongs—why does Paul then speak only of the altar?

But perhaps he was, as Lietzmann[2] supposes, indebted to a Hellenistic usage of speech, or was reluctant to make such a statement regarding a Jewish sacrifice, and consequently dwelt no longer on this example, which appeared to him less suitable. Indeed, when in v.[19] he writes: "*What say I then? that a thing sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything?*"—does not that assume that in what precedes he actually spoke of a real union with the deity? Otherwise would it not be inept to spend words over the conclusion which is apparently deducible from this, viz. that an idol is something? And does not Paul also say again (v.[20]) that he would not that the Corinthians should have communion with daemons? And when he then proceeds (v.[21]): "*Ye* CANNOT *drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of daemons:*

knowledgment of Himself, of His death symbolically indicated in the 'wine-blood,' and of the community of His members symbolically represented in the 'bread-body.'" But this explanation of σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ harmonizes only with v.[17] (discussed above on p. 241); in v.[16] the parallelism with the αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (which von Dobschütz, as we shall see, interprets aright) compels us to explain the σῶμα as His body given to death, not His mystic body.

[1] *Theologie*, ii. 184. [2] *Handbuch*, iii. 123.

ye CANNOT *partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of daemons*"—does this not imply that by so eating and drinking, *ex opere operato*, one necessarily enters into union with the divine being in question, and for that very reason can only participate in the one celebration? Also the fact that he says "partake of the *table* of the Lord or of daemons," not "partake of the Lord or of daemons," could not be urged as an objection: for the meaning was intelligible in view of the first half of the verse, which spoke of the cup of the Lord and of daemons. On the other hand, as von Dobschütz has very rightly observed, it must on that hypothesis be surprising that Paul finally puts the question (v.[22]): "*Or do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than he?*" If mere participation in the heathen sacrificial meals made the Christians have communion with daemons, then no special punishment from God would be at all necessary, for the participants were *ipso facto* undone! Certainly: the weak brethren in Corinth, who feared to eat with an unbeliever or to purchase in the market because the flesh might have been offered to idols, must have regarded it in that light; indeed, they clearly held the view that the daemon lived permanently in such flesh, and would pass into them if they ate of it. But Paul himself not only did *not* share this idea, and therefore enjoined the Corinthians to eat everything that was sold in the market and set before them in heathen houses (v.[25ff.]), but he did not believe in any real union with daemons produced by the sacrifice itself. Even at the beginning of the chapter, where he recounts the symbolical experiences of the Israelites, he does not refer to sins that had been their own retribution, but to those that were directly or indirectly punished by God in His displeasure. So it is probable that Paul treated the communion with daemons, into which the Corinthians would enter by actual worship of idols, not as a *real union* with them, but as an *adherence* to them, which precludes a similar adherence to Christ, and *therefore* cannot be simultaneously professed. Further, the notion that an idol is something, is denied on this account only, that at sacrifice or before the altar one avows himself as the worshipper of a divine being, *not*

because one enters into real union with him. And there is nothing said here about such a union in the Lord's Supper: it is profession of adherence to Christ, and primarily not to the exalted Christ, but to Him who died for us[1]—precisely as in 11[23ff.].

But does the succeeding passage (v.[26ff.]) not go beyond this? Bousset[2] is surprised at the expression already quoted, "*Ye proclaim the Lord's death*," but it is very simply explained if the Lord's Supper is understood by Paul in the same way as by earlier Christians. Most of those who appeal to chap. 11 for their interpretation of the Pauline statements, think rather of the words that follow (11[27ff.]): "*Whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of* THE BODY AND THE BLOOD OF THE LORD. *But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not* THE BODY. *For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep.*" To dwell first of all on the closing words, some find in them the view that when there is unworthy participation, the food itself produces these noxious effects. But there is nothing that points to this: it is rather excluded by what follows. For the passage proceeds (v.[32]): "*When we are judged of the Lord, we are chastened that we may not be condemned with the world*": these chastisements, then, are disciplinary, inflicted by God, not immediate effects of the sacred food unworthily eaten or drunk. Bousset,[3] therefore, takes quite an unwarrantable view when he says: "Nevertheless, behind this we catch glimpses of definitely sacramental feeling, the belief in the marvellous virtue of sacred food, whether for weal or woe." And—to pass to another aspect of the question—even if Bousset's statement were correct, one

[1] Cp. J. Réville, "Les origines de l'eucharistie," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 1907, lvi. 159: "La *κοινωνία τῶν δαιμόνων*, la communion avec les démons, ne signifie pas l'absorption de la chair des démons, pas plus que la *κοινωνία τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου* ne signifie l'absorption de l'autel; c'est évident. . . . Dans l'une comme dans l'autre alternative il s'agit de la solidarité attestée par le repas religieux, d'une part avec les démons, d'autre part avec le sang et le corps du Christ."

[2] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 1. 111. [3] *Ibid.* 112.

would not be justified in pointing out, like Heitmüller,[1] "that the Syrians, who regarded the fishes of Atargatis as sacred, believed that they could not eat anchovies without being visited by ulcers, tumours, and pestilence; or . . . that the Elk-clan of Indians cannot eat the flesh of the elk without having ulcers." I do not lay stress on the fact that Porphyrius, *De Abstin.* iv. 15, only says: *τὸ μέντοι τῶν ἰχθύων ἀπέχεσθαι ἄχρι τῶν Μενάνδρου χρόνων τοῦ κωμικοῦ διέμεινε*: for even if one should leave the Elk-clan of Indians out of the reckoning, similar views or practices might have been maintained elsewhere for a longer time. But in the case of Paul we have to do, as von Dobschütz[2] very rightly says, "not with participation in a prohibited food, but with the unworthy participation in the usual sacred meal." Indeed, so far as the preceding context is concerned, several upholders of that interpretation of the Pauline statements which we are now discussing even admit that men can also, through indifference towards the symbols of the body and blood of Christ, commit an offence against Him. I have myself on an earlier occasion cited as proof of this the passage *Clem. Hom.* iii. 17: *ὁ εἰκόνα, καὶ ταῦτα αἰωνίου βασιλέως ὑβρίσας, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἀναφερομένην ἔχει, οὗπερ καθ' ὁμοιωσιν ἡ εἰκὼν ἐτύγχανεν οὖσα.* Accordingly, when some of these scholars, in spite of this, find it here again presupposed that the body and blood of Christ, or, at any rate, that the exalted Christ, is through the Lord's Supper applied *realiter* to the believer, that can only be explained as the endeavour, perhaps unconscious, to attribute the crudest possible notions to the Apostle. They are as indemonstrable here as in the other passages previously discussed.[3] Moreover, a general objection may be urged against them. Communion with Christ is to be brought about by the Lord's Supper: but according to Pauline teaching it is surely already present, not in virtue of, but since

[1] *Taufe*, 50 f. [2] *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 33.

[3] Even if this were the case, the contradiction which would then exist between v.$^{23ff.}$ and v.$^{26 \text{ or } 27ff.}$ must not be ultimately explained (as Bousset would explain it in J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 1. 111) as not a difference *of idea* but only a difference *of feeling*.

the time of, baptism. So H. Holtzmann,[1] taking the sacramental estimate of baptism also for granted, writes: "The relation of the two acts which constitute religious communion, corresponds at all events to the Reformed formula: *Nascimur, pascimur.*" Heitmüller says:[2] "In baptism one's being is established in Christ; in the Lord's Supper the being of Christ in us [is this something different?] is nourished and strengthened." Wrede[3] says: "Union with Christ has, indeed, existed ever since baptism, but through the Lord's Supper it is renewed and strengthened." But Paul nowhere expresses himself in this way, and so he probably did not understand communion with Christ in the Lord's Supper in the sense attributed to him.[4]

Yet as in chap. 10 we found a peculiar interpretation of heathen sacrificial meals, so in chap. 11 we become acquainted with a form of celebration of the Lord's Supper which differs from the original one. In both cases, however, the divergence is probably to be attributed not to Paul but to the Corinthians. "*When ye assemble yourselves together,*" says Paul (1 Co 11[20f.]), "*it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper: for in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken.*" This debasement of the Lord's Supper may, of course—if it is permissible to deal with this question at once—have appeared in the Corinthian Church without direct external influence: it is, however, equally possible that heathen repasts furnished a bad example. And there again it is most natural to think of the feasts held by the associations for worship: at any rate, Tertullian sets the Lord's Supper alongside of these when he says (*Apol.* 39): "*Saliis coenaturis creditor erit necessarius, Herculanarum decimarum et polluctorum sumptus tabularii supputabunt, Apaturiis, Dionysiis, mysteriis Atticis*

[1] *Theologie*, ii. 185 f. [2] *Taufe*, 33; cp. *Die Religion*, i. 41.

[3] *Paulus*, 72.

[4] Cp. also Soltau, *Fortleben*, 183: "That even Paul himself should have held such a materialistic view of the Lord's Supper, may reasonably be doubted. One must remark, in dealing with any of his expositions of the subject, that they are taken from 'occasional' writings, that these controversial works were directed against the opponents of the gospel, and that they often sought to combat and overcome these opponents with their own weapons."

cocorum dilectus indicitur, ad fumum cocnae Sarapiacae spartcoli excitabuntur : de solo triclinio Christianorum retractatur."[1] The origin of that interpretation of the heathen sacrificial feasts in chap. 10, and of the expressions (κοινωνία and κοινωνός) used by Paul to describe his own view, yet not exactly suitable to it, is a question which we shall examine with greater success when we have first discussed Jn 6. For that is the one New Testament passage still remaining which certainly refers to the Lord's Supper.[2]

No doubt this last statement also is contested, but only on the assumption, which here as elsewhere is clearly untenable, that the discourses of Jesus in John's Gospel are historical. From v.[48] the discourse speaks of Christ as the bread of life; then in v.[51] there is added: "*And the bread which I will give is my flesh* [*which I will give*] *for the life of the world*"; and then in v.[53ff.] the passage continues: "*Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves*," etc. Now this must be due to some special reason: in other words, these verses, which on that account cannot have been spoken by Jesus, must refer to the Lord's Supper. But do they not contradict the saying of v.[63] "*It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing*"? and are they not therefore (and to some extent under any circumstances) to be eliminated?[3] I do not regard this as necessary: for the saying just quoted does not refer to the thought expounded in v.[51] and v.[53ff.], but to the objection raised immediately before by many disciples ("*This is a hard saying*"), and expressed already in v.[52] by the Jews, "*How can this man give us his flesh to eat?*" Like all similar objections in the Gospel of John, this is based on a misunderstanding: the disciples and the Jews think of the earthly body of the

[1] Cp. also Lietzmann, *Handbuch*, iii. 130 f., 160 ff.

[2] He 13[10] "*We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle*," does not, I think, *pace* O. Holtzmann, "Der Hebraeerbrief u. das Abendmahl," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1909, 251 ff., refer to the Lord's Supper. Gunkel (in J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 38 f.) finds a reference to it in 1 P 2[3] in the words "*Ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious*": but this view has nothing to support it.

[3] Cp., finally, von Dobschütz, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 17; van den Bergh van Eysinga, *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1905, 251 f.; Wellhausen, *Erweiterungen*, 29; Andersen, "Zu Joh. 6[51bff.]," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1908, 163 f.

Son of Man, Jesus (or the Evangelist) of the heavenly body. Thus John appears indeed—as is generally believed—to have actually taught a real union with the exalted Christ in the Lord's Supper: and yet what we read further in v.[63] "*The* WORDS *that I have spoken unto you*" (not the Lord's Supper) "*are spirit and are life,*" is not in keeping with this. To put the matter more precisely, since the Lord's Supper is spoken of just before in v.[51] and v.[53ff.], the Evangelist regarded it as *verbum visibile*, not as sacrament; and the sacramental view is attributed to him, as it is to Paul, unwarrantably. But, on the other hand, why in that case does he first say, "Ye must eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood," and "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed"? It is *possible* that he uses these formulae only to reject them afterwards in v.[63] (no doubt this is not expressly done): but at all events he adapts himself to a mode of speech such as was customary in his surroundings, and such as certainly presupposes the view that one *partakes* of the flesh and blood of Christ and thereby experiences supernatural effects—in other words, presupposes a sacramental view. Thus John does not himself inculcate such teaching, but his mode of expression shows us that such a conception did exist in his *milieu*.

Now, since this conception would hardly have arisen from the "words of institution" *alone*, it might be traced to those expressions, "communion of the body and blood of Christ" and the like, which were employed by Paul and perhaps also by others. In that case we should have an opportunity of observing here that compulsive power of the formula of which we have already spoken (p. 228 f.). But ultimately this would only be a postponement of the problem: for the question would arise, Where do these expressions in Paul's Epistle originate? Besides, the view of the Lord's Supper presupposed in John's Gospel *can* have still other grounds; and, finally, we must give an explanation of the notion which (as we have shown) existed among the Corinthians, but which certainly existed elsewhere as well, the view, namely, that in the act of sacrifice one enters into a real union with the heathen gods or daemons. The question then is, Does

there exist anywhere in the *milieu* of early Christianity the theory that one may enter into real communion with the deity or may even participate of him?

Although, of course, it would not contribute anything to the understanding of the Corinthians' belief, one turns first of all to sacramental ideas which may have been transmitted through the medium of Judaism. But is it possible definitely to indicate such ideas, which in view of the character of Judaism above discussed (p. 212 f.) would certainly have to be traced to heathen influences?[1]

O. Holtzmann[2] supposes that Paul regarded the Lord's Supper as a mortuary repast, at which the deceased person was considered as the guest of the living; and that it was for this reason that he not only spoke of a communion with Christ, a table of the Lord, but also traced illnesses and deaths to unworthy eating and drinking. For it corresponds (he says) "to the widespread popular conception that an unworthy demeanour at a mortuary repast irritates the spirit of the deceased (which takes part in the celebration and is honoured by it), so that it works all manner of injury." I believe that I have on earlier pages (p. 250 f.) explained the passage more simply, and, besides, I am very doubtful whether Paul would have thought of the dead man as being present at the funeral feast, though such a feast was generally celebrated among the Jews. But, above all, such a custom cannot, I think, have influenced the Lord's Supper: for this reason, that the Lord's Supper was at first observed daily, subsequently every week, whereas the mortuary repast was celebrated only once, or at the most once every year.

On the ground that we know too little regarding the other common meals in Jewish life, of which, however, we do hear, Bousset[3] refers at one point to the passage in 2 Es $14^{38ff.}$, where, he says, sacramental ideas reveal themselves. But when it is there said that a cup was handed to Esdras

[1] The passages Is 65^{4} 66^{17}, to which Heitmüller, *Taufe*, 50, calls attention, refer (even according to B. Duhm, *Jesaja*, 455) to sacramental meals, but belong to a much earlier time.

[2] *War Jesus Ekstatiker?* 109; cp. also Heitmüller, *Die Religion*, i. 44.

[3] *Religion*, 230 ff., 529 f.

filled as it were with water the colour of which was like fire, and that after he had drunk of it he dictated for forty days to five scribes, this cup is only the symbol of a revelation communicated to him. One might rather, with Chapuis [1] and Heitmüller,[2] think of the Essenes, who, according to Josephus (*BJ* ii. 8. 5, 8, *Ant.* xviii. 1. 5), had their food prepared for them by priests, went to their dining-hall as though into a sanctuary, and partook of the meal in such reverent stillness that to those who passed by, it seemed as though some awful mystery were being celebrated within. Again, Philo (in Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* viii. 11. 11) speaks of this with a turn of expression borrowed from the Mysteries; but does it follow that the Essenes themselves really attributed to their repasts a sacramental meaning in the proper sense of the term? They seem to have held them in this way simply because they wished not to defile themselves; their sitting in one company was in accordance with their whole mode of life; but there is nothing whatsoever to suggest that their common repasts were, in their view, a means of bringing them into union with God.

Lastly, Feine [3] attempts yet another way of demonstrating the existence of such sacramental views within Judaism. He points to the passage in Philo, *De Vict. Off.* 8 (ed. Mangey, ii. 245), where Philo represents God as saying to the man who wishes on the third day to eat of the "sacrifice of deliverance": *τεθυκέναι νομίζων, ὦ καταγέλαστε, οὐ τέθυκας. Οὐ προσηκάμην ἀθύτων, ἀνιέρων, βεβήλων, ἀκαθάρτων, ὧν ἥψηκας κρεῶν, ὦ γαστρίμαργε, θυσιῶν οὐδ' ὄναρ ἐπῃσθημένος.* But when Feine remarks on this: "The *προσήκειν* of God to the flesh of the victims means in this context the imparting of such powers as minister to the salvation and recovery of body and soul, and these are therefore divine powers which enter into a man when he partakes of such sacrificial flesh"—he is unfortunately guilty of a serious blunder. *Προσηκάμην* is not a part of *προσήκειν* (which could not, besides, be taken directly in the sense which Feine attributes to it) but of *προσίεσθαι* (accept).[4] Even from Philo, then, the sacramental

[1] *Revue de théol. et de phil.*, 1903, 202 f. [2] *Taufe*, 47, 52.
[3] *Jesus Christus u. Paulus*, 1902, 217 f.
[4] Strange to say, even von Dobschütz, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1905, 29, n. 2, has

view of such a meal cannot be proved; and if it could, it would not entirely correspond to the view presupposed by Paul or even by John.

Thus we can understand why the majority of other scholars think rather of direct pagan influences which might have produced this view. Can these influences actually be discovered?

Originally, sacrifice has, *in many cases* at least, been intended to unite the worshipper with the deity by making the former partake of the latter, or of a symbol representing him, or, it may be, of a sacred meal. It is in this way that one may explain many customs that still existed in later times: but here the all-important question is, Was the *view* on which these customs are ultimately based, still held in later times? Heitmüller[1] appeals on this point to Gruppe;[2] and Gruppe, as a proof of the thesis "that through the repast shared with the deity a mystic inspiration passes over to the participants," cites *Myth. Vat.* i. 177: "*Templum Junonis fuit, in quo mensam Hercules et Diana lectum habebat, ubi portabantur pueri, ut de ipsa mensa ederent et inde acciperent fortitudinem et in lecto Dianae dormirent, ut omnibus amabiles fierent et illorum generatio succresceret.*" But we must point out that there is nothing said there of a union with the deity even in the eating (or in the sleeping). Gruppe continues thus: "Even of the custom of producing a mystic union with the deity by eating of him, traces have probably been preserved; it seems, at any rate, as if the 'enthusiasm' of the bacchantes, according to the original conception, did not cause the ecstasy in which they tore animals in pieces, but as if, on the other hand, they imagined the deity to be present in the animal and intended through devouring its raw flesh to receive the deity within themselves, to become ἔνθεοι": but this avowedly refers to "the original conception." Gruppe says further: "Lastly, it may be

not observed this mistake on Feine's part, but only proposes to read instead of προσηκάμην perhaps προσηψάμην. But that is not necessary: perhaps there is no need even to interpolate (with Cohn) before ἀθύτων the words οὐδὲν τῶν or χρῆσιν, or (with Wendland) θοίνην, but only to place the genitives ἀθύτων—ἀκαθάρτων after θυσιῶν.

[1] *Taufe*, 41, 49.

[2] *Mythologie*, 731 f., 734 f.

pointed out that one authoritative witness for such rites, Plutarch (*Qu. Rom.* 112), interprets a similar rite of the bacchantes, the *σπαραγμός* and the eating of ivy, in this way, that the 'enthusiasm' is produced by such participation; for it may be accepted as certain that here the ivy that is torn in pieces represents Bacchus, who is elsewhere thought of as dwelling among ivy." But this last statement, which is the important point here, seems to me by no means certain, although I admit that the sacred sprays were themselves called *βάκχοι* (and Dionysus, *Κισσός*): at any rate, Plutarch merely says of the ivy: *μὴ παντελῶς ἀπιθάνους εἶναι τοὺς λέγοντας*—this cautious mode of expression is also noticeable —*ὅτι καὶ πνεῦμα μανίας ἔχων ἐγερτικὸν καὶ παρακλητικόν, ἐξίστησι καὶ σπαράττει.* One cannot therefore conclude from the passage "that the conception, nowhere expressly mentioned (!), of eating of the deity . . . persisted throughout the whole period of antiquity in the circles concerned"; nor has Farnell[1] brought forward more convincing proofs. Further, when Heinrici[2] says: "The question put by Cotta the Epicurean priest (Cic. *ND* iii. 16. 41), viz. 'Do you think that there is any one so deluded as to believe that what he eats is god?' cannot be answered in the negative"—this statement is true of an earlier time only. All this being so, it is not possible to derive from heathen thought the expression "communion with Christ or with daemons," or the Corinthians' belief in such communion, or the belief (present in John's *milieu*) in an eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of the Son of Man: still less can one follow Heitmüller,[3] who unaccountably compares with the designation *Χριστιανοί*, as applied to the adherents of Jesus, the names that were derived from heathen gods and applied to the adherents whom they had severally "inspired." Again, when Paul in reference to the Lord's Supper speaks of the covenant and gives a place to the idea of atonement, we must not conclude that he does so because partaking of the deity was the oldest form of covenant and atonement. That the latter of these

[1] "Sacrificial Communion in Greek Religion," *Hibb. Journ.*, 1903–4, ii. 306 ff.

[2] *Hellenismus u. Christentum*, 1909, 36.

[3] *Taufe*, 41, n. 3, 43.

was thought of in this connexion is perhaps a controvertible point; at all events, Paul believed that atonement had been accomplished in quite a different way, and *for this reason* spoke of a covenant concluded through the death of Jesus. On the other hand, the expression which Paul uses, "communion with Christ or daemons," might perhaps be derived from a *usage of speech* which had been retained from the time when men believed that they entered by means of sacrifice into union with the deity.[1] Or had this view itself survived in some circles, and, so surviving, had it not only suggested that expression directly to Paul, but also suggested to the Corinthians their belief that a union with heathen gods or daemons could be produced by means of sacrifices?

Dieterich[2] has pointed out that in the liturgy which he regarded as Mithraic, the God is thus implored: *μένε σὺν ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ μου*, and that similarly in a London Papyrus there is the expression: *ἐλθέ μοι, κύριε Ἑρμῆ, ὡς τὰ βρέφη εἰς τὰς κοιλίας τῶν γυναικῶν*, and in the Leyden Papyrus II.: *σὺ γὰρ εἶ ἐγὼ καὶ ἐγὼ σύ*. But these do not refer to a union with the deity by means of a repast; and even in the *ἱερὰ λῆψις τοῦ παρέδρου*, in the first Berlin Magical Papyrus, to which Reitzenstein[3] calls attention, there is nothing in regard to this. "The mystes has to prepare a couch, and in front of it to set a table with wine and *ἄψυχα φαγήματα*: then he lays himself down to await the god. If the god comes, the instructions are: *σὺ δὲ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ κάθελκε καὶ κατάκλινον αὐτόν, ὡς προεῖπον*. This last reference is to lines 37 ff., which, unfortunately, are mutilated: *καὶ τίθει σεαυτὸν πρὸς χρῆσιν τῆς βρώ[σεως τοῦ] δείπνου καὶ τῆς προκειμένης παραθέσεως . . . στόμα πρὸς στόμα συνομί[λει]*." Here the god certainly appears at and for a repast, but he is not united with the believer *by means of* it. Indeed, as Hoffmann[4] also concludes, there is no evidence that this last belief existed at

[1] Deissmann, "Licht vom Osten," *Christl. Welt*, 1904, 3 f., *Licht vom Osten*, 254 [Eng. trans. 355], points out that, as Paul spoke of a table of the Lord or of daemons, so men spoke, *e.g.* of a table of Serapis: but he shows at the same time that the former expressions could equally well come from the Old Testament. This has not been observed by Lietzmann, *Handbuch*, iii. 124.

[2] *Mithrasliturgie*, 100 f.

[3] *Poimandres*, 226 f.

[4] *Abendmahl*, 247.

all in later times: still less can one say that the notion was any longer entertained that men *partake of* the god.[1] Certainly sacred meals play an important part in the Mysteries, and there is a belief in the possibility of a union with the deity: but these are only distant and general analogies to the views which we are trying to elucidate.

Still, O. Pfleiderer[2] believed that he could find a closer parallel to these in the Mithraic Mysteries; and Heitmüller[3] also, and possibly H. Holtzmann,[4] think specially of them as a prototype for the Christian ideas. The two first-named scholars have specially in mind two representations of the sacred repast in the Mithraic Mysteries which have been found in Bosnia and Rome[5] (Fig. 10). The two mystae are here represented in the attitude in which Sol and Mithras usually appear, reclining at a table behind a tripod on which small loaves of bread are laid, one of the figures holding a drinking-horn in his hand; but no one on that account says that Sol and Mithras were conceived as being present at the meal. Cumont[6] takes the representation to mean that "l'acte sacramental, que la liturgie prescrivait, était accompli en commémoration de celuï dont le dieu avait autrefois donné l'exemple," and describes it as "une nouvelle preuve du parallélisme qu'on a certainement cherché à établir au IIIe siècle entre les traditions mazdéennes et les doctrines de l'Église"—in other words, as too late to furnish any aid towards the elucidation of the New Testament. But the manner in which the mystae who stand around the two seated figures are represented (viz. as a raven, a Persian, a soldier, and a lion) appears to Pfleiderer a real proof of the belief that the worshipper by means of the sacred meal "put on" the god. And certainly these masks of animal faces which the mystae wore on certain occasions, and the corresponding names given to the wearers (in the same way as to

[1] Even the further instances cited by Lietzmann, *Handbuch*, iii. 124 f., do not furnish this result—in fact, they have no connexion with this subject.

[2] *Christusbild*, 87 ff., 105 [Eng. trans. 129 ff., 155].

[3] *Taufe*, 46.

[4] *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1904, 66.

[5] Cp. Cumont, *Textes*, i. 176; "Notice sur deux bas-reliefs mithriaques," *Revue arch.*, 1902, i. 10 ff.

[6] *Textes*, i. 176.

adherents of other cults), are explained by the original conception that the believer became one with the god, who was represented in animal form. Subsequently the ravens and lions became particular classes of mystae, and gradually others were added—Persians, because Mithraism came from Persia; soldiers, because their service was regarded as a holy war against the powers of evil.[1] But the hypothesis that this origin of the animal names and masks was still *known* in later times, has no evidence in its favour, and is *a priori* quite unlikely: indeed, even if it should be accepted, it would still have to be proved that the god was supposed to be "put on" *by means of the repast*. Cumont,[2] on the contrary, thinks it probable that the "lions" were allowed to partake first, and that *on that account* (as tradition informs us) they received at the same time the title of μετέχοντες. Thus the theory of the Mithraic repast also appears to have only the same distant resemblance to the views presupposed in the New Testament as the theory of the mystery-repasts in general: or are there other grounds for supposing that the Mithraic feast in particular exercised an influence on Christianity?

After establishing the sacramental character of the Mithraic feast by quotations from Justin (*Apol.* i. 66) and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xxx. 17), Dieterich[3] says: "Unfortunately, no one can tell what connexion this feast may have with the well-known sacrifice of a bull, or even with the other sacrifice of a similar victim which will be repeated at the end of the days." He *appears* therefore to think it possible that such a connexion exists, and *perhaps* also that the Mithraic feast for this reason could more readily influence the Lord's Supper, in which also a sacrificial death was commemorated. Such a view might possibly be held, but only so long as the character of that supposed sacrifice of a bull is not fully realized. As Cumont[4] shows, the representation which we perpetually find

[1] Cp. *Textes*, i. 315 ff.; Dieterich, *Mithrasliturgie*, 150 f. Gruppe's different interpretation of the matter in *Mythologie*, 1598, n. 3, is less probable.

[2] *Textes*, i. 321. [3] *Mithrasliturgie*, 102 f.

[4] *Textes*, i. 184 ff. I quote the chief passages: "Suivant les croyances avestiques (*Bund.* 3. 17; 4. 1; 10. 1; 14. 1; 27. 2) le premier des êtres vivants créés par Ahura-Mazda fut un taureau. L'Esprit du mal l'accabla de maux et le fit périr, mais, phénomène prodigieux, sa mort fut l'origine de toute la

of Mithras slaying the bull (Fig. 11) has reference to the creation, which was believed to have been brought to pass in this way, and at the same time to the future preparation of the drink of immortality; but with an atoning sacrifice, or even with the sacred feast, it has absolutely no connexion.[1] On these lines, then, no more plausible case can be made out for the supposition that the Mithraic Mysteries have influenced the Christian conception of the Lord's Supper.

O. Pfleiderer[2] says, on the other hand: "Though there is no parallel in the banquet of Mithras to this blood-symbolism

végétation terrestre. Faut-il croire que les prêtres de Mithra racontaient ce même mythe en substituant à Ahriman leur divinité principale comme auteur de ce trépas salutaire? Un détail étrange qui se répète sur presque tous nos monuments, ne permet guère d'en douter: la queue dressée de l'animal expirant se termine par une touffe d'épis. Évidemment on attachait à cet appendice bizarre quelque sens symbolique. Or, d'après le texte du Boundahish, quand périt le taureau primitif, les diverses espèces de plantes sortirent de toutes les parties de son corps et surtout de sa moelle épinière. Ne semble-t-il pas certain que l'artiste grec [who produced the first representation of this sort] ne pouvant représenter par la sculpture cette floraison merveilleuse, s'est contenté de l'indiquer en terminant par un bouquet d'épis l'extrémité de la colonne vertébrale de la victime moribonde? Une variante qu'on observe sur le plus ancien de tous nos marbres italiens corrobore cette interprétation: trois épis sortent, au lieu de sang, de l'endroit que vient de frapper le couteau de Mithra, et montrent bien que leur croissance a été provoquée par cette blésure. Ailleurs l'idée symbolique, exprimée par les épis naissants, est complétée par la présence d'arbustes poussant dans la grotte à côté du taureau abattu. . . . Le spectacle de l'immolation du taureau éveillait sans doute encore dans l'esprit des fidèles d'autres idées qui les touchaient plus profondément. Il est probable que les légendes cosmogoniques étaient mises en rapport avec les idées des mages relatives à la fin du monde. Les livres mazdéens (*Bund.* 30. 25) prédisent qu'au jour suprême, le héros Saoshyañt tuera un taureau, et de la graisse de celui-ci, mélangée au jus du Haoma blanc, préparera un breuvage qui assurera l'immortalité à tous les hommes qui en goûteront. Il est certain que les doctrines eschatologiques analogues s'étaient transmises dans les mystères mithriaques. . . . La seule transformation subie par les croyances anciennes c'est la fusion de Saoshyañt avec Mithra, phénomène facile à comprendre dans un culte de secte où le dieu favori réunit naturellement en lui toutes les puissances." Gruppe's objections to this (*Mythologie*, 1597, n. 6) do not appear to me convincing.

[1] Further, that at a later time the slaying of the bull by Mithras was compared with the sacrifice of Christ, is not to be inferred from the passage in Augustine's writings cited above (p. 1): the Pileatus whose priest is there described as being accustomed to say, "*Et ipse Pileatus Christianus est*," is more probably Attis.

[2] *Christusbild*, 89 [Eng. trans. 131].

of the Christian sacrament, one is certainly found in the blood-baptism of the taurobolia and the criobolia, which belongs to the Mysteries of Cybele and perhaps also to those of Mithras." But this rite was introduced into the cult of Cybele only in the second century of the Christian era: its connexion with the Mysteries of Mithras started even later: on this account its influence on Christianity would be no proof of *their* influence. Indeed, Allard[1] and Hepding[2] think it possible that the later form of the taurobolia is partly derived from Christianity. But even if this view is not accepted, one can hardly, with Gunkel[3] and J. Weiss,[4] explain the sprinkling with the blood of Christ (He 9^{14}, 1 P 1^{2}, Rev 1^{5}) as an idea that has originated in the taurobolia rather than in the Old Testament.

Nor is the position sounder when O. Pfleiderer,[5] previously to this, observes: "A noteworthy point of coincidence is found in the fact that in both cases the same uncertainty exists regarding the contents of the cup, whether they were only water or water and wine: for the original cup of the Christian sacrament did not always at all events contain wine, since no mention is ever made of wine at the primitive Christian love-feasts in the Book of Acts." But this book does not mention the cup at all: and the theory has long been refuted that the term "cup" always employed by Paul, or even his words in Ro 14^{21} "*It is good not to drink wine, whereby thy brother stumbleth*," could prove that there were celebrations of the Lord's Supper with water.[6] On the other hand, Cumont,[7] at any rate, says regarding the Mithraic feast, that doubtless in later times wine was mixed with the water; and although Justin's description does not harmonize with this statement, still from this uncertainty no plausible case can be made out for an influence of the Mithraic Mysteries upon Christianity.[8]

[1] *Julien l'apostat*, i., 1900, 30 ff.
[2] *Attis*, 200, n. 7.
[3] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 30.
[4] *Ibid.* 91.
[5] *Christusbild*, 88 f., cp. 105 [Eng. trans. 130, 155].
[6] So also *Urchristentum*, i. 300 [Eng. trans. i. 422].
[7] *Textes*, i. 320.
[8] In reference to Mk 4^{11} "*Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables*," Jeremias, *Babylonisches*, 107, says, "In the Mithraic Mysteries the mystes comes to know

Such a theory must give way also before the general considerations already mentioned.[1]

But while this is true of the Mithraic feast, another meal, which we find earlier in Mazdeism and later in Mandaeism, might, I think, alongside of other influences, have affected Christianity in certain places. For the Mandaean Supper may really, as Brandt[2] believes, be older than the Lord's Supper, and may go back to the sacred feast of Parsism: for the "daruns" of the Parsic feast appear to have had the same form as the Mandaean "pehtâ."[3] Thus

the secret of religion," etc.: but there is absolutely nothing here that points definitely to them.

[1] Grussendorf (*Zeitschr. f. d. evang. Religionsunterricht*, 1907–8, 65 f.) writes characteristically: "It may very well be possible that the cult of Mithras influenced Paul directly, for his native town was a centre of this cultus *certainly* as early as the days of the Apostle's youth. But such a direct influence *is not demonstrable*."

[2] *Mand. Rel.* 141, 203 f. Kessler, on the other hand, says (*Prot. Realencykl.*[3] xii. 180, 183): "The Mandaeans . . . quite certainly passed through a period of acquaintance and sympathy with ancient Christianity . . ., and from this time onwards there remained in their cultus as permanently inseparable elements the two chief sacraments, viz. Baptism (which probably was observed long before Christianity, but was not regarded as sacred) and the Eucharist. The basis of both of these, and also of the two sacraments of ancient Christianity, is the transformation of a naturalistic practice derived from a corresponding Babylonian and Aramaean sphere: but neither of the two Mandaean rites could have attained its present form without the aid of Christian influence. . . . Further, the second sacrament of the Mandaeans, the Eucharist, can only be regarded as a custom which grew up in the soil of Nature-religion, as a worshipping of the plain elements and gifts of nature, not as the Christian mystery in a paganized form." One must remark, in the first place, that Kessler's real meaning is difficult to grasp; and, secondly, that the basis of the Mandaean Eucharist is not Babylonian, but Parsic. This criticism holds also against Zimmern (*Keilinschriften*, 525 f.), who connects the Lord's Supper with the Babylonian "bread of life and water of life": but there is no evidence that these played a part in the cultus. The case stands otherwise with the Babylonian *pit pī* and *mis pī*, to which Zimmern calls attention ["Das vermutliche babylonische Vorbild des Pehtā und Membūhā der Mandäer," *Orientalische Studien f. Nöldeke*, 1906 (ii.), 959 ff.]: but these would, I think, serve to explain only the *terminology*.

[3] Brandt, *Mand. Rel.* 203, cites Spiegel's description of the "daruns": "They are little cakes about the size of a thaler"—and on p. 109, Siouffi's description of the "pehtâ": "For ordinary needs it is prepared only once a year: wheaten flour which has been kneaded with water into disks of the size of a five franc piece." Indeed Darmesteter, *Zend-Avesta*, i. Ann. du Musée Guimet, xxi., 1892, lxv, also calls "le darûn petit pain, un peu plus grand qu'une pièce de cinq francs." Siouffi proceeds: "On each side of the small

as early as the first century of our era such a sacred repast was probably celebrated in Mesopotamia, and it *might* then in that region, like the Greek Mysteries elsewhere, have influenced the Lord's Supper. Indeed, so far as the view presupposed in John's Gospel is concerned, it is perhaps possible in still another aspect to make out a plausible case for one or other of these influences. John says (6^{53}): "*Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not* LIFE *in yourselves.*" *If*, now, the circles known to him also regarded the Lord's Supper in this way, they were likely to be influenced, or to have been influenced, by an original Mandaean feast, or a Mystery feast: for these feasts also were primarily viewed as conferring immortality. But that assumption does not admit of proof: if we prefer not to make it, we can only say that Mandaeism in its original form or (it may be, *and*) the Mysteries have influenced Christianity not only in another respect, but also in so far as a sacred meal formed part of their observances. On the other hand, it cannot be proved even in *this* connexion that men believed that through such a meal they entered into real union with the deity, or that they partook of him. We must, therefore, explain in another way the corresponding views presupposed in the New Testament; and there, as regards the Corinthians' belief that one must refrain from partaking of flesh which has once had any connexion with heathen sacrificial worship, we shall think of the belief in daemons described above (p. 112 f.), and therefore also suppose that these Corinthians themselves (and not Paul before them) regarded the heathen gods as daemons. The other idea, of which the Gospel of John takes cognizance, that in the Lord's Supper one partakes of the flesh and blood of Christ, we shall be able, with Hoffmann,[1] to explain adequately by the "words of institution" on the one hand, and by the faith in the activity of the exalted Christ on the other; for it is quite inconceivable that, without any

disks . . . are poured four drops of sesame-oil and four drops of the blood of a newly-killed dove 'en forme de croix.'" One might again compare with this the representation of the sacred loaves of the Mithraic feast as we find it in the Bosnian relief mentioned on p. 260 above: but perhaps this also already shows Christian influence.

[1] *Abendmahl*, 252.

other trace of its existence, the original belief in the possibility of receiving the god into oneself by partaking of food should have made its reappearance in the Christian Church, and there alone. Accordingly, even this interpretation of the Lord's Supper, which in the New Testament is merely presupposed, is not traceable to pagan influences; the similar view of sacrifices is to be found only among Christians who to that extent are still heathen; as for the term *κοινωνία* in Paul's writings, our conclusion is that stated above (p. 259). The doctrine which the New Testament really teaches regarding the Lord's Supper cannot be derived, even collaterally or by way of supplement, from pagan sources: with reference to *it*, at any rate, it is simply false to say "that baptism as well as the Lord's Supper already within the books of the New Testament underwent the fateful transformation from symbolic act to *sacramentum efficax*."[1]

[1] So Anrich, *Arch. der Strassb. Pastoralkonf.*, 1895, 350 f.

PART II.

A.—LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS.

1. The Gospel Narrative as a whole.

The second of the main divisions of this work must start, like the first, with the examination of a hypothesis which involves the denial not only of the genuineness of the great Pauline Epistles, but also of the historicity of the New Testament representation of Jesus. Jensen[1] believes that he can trace the major part of Jesus' history and a small part also of His teaching to the Epic or Legend of Gilgamesh, or, to put the matter still more precisely, to an Israelitish form of that Epic.[2] Zimmern[3] in general agrees: even Brückner,[4] Beer,[5] and Wundt[6] do not reject his theory entirely. However, this hypothesis, like the one which makes Christianity originate in Graeco-Roman philosophy, will appear to most people *a priori* inadmissible: still, like that other, it must be fully considered, since in its details there may possibly be elements of truth. And the more for this reason, that we have really to do with a scientific theory, the author of which suspects, besides, that there may be "an endeavour to cudgel

[1] *Das Gilgameschepos in der Weltliteratur*, 1906, i. 811 ff.

[2] When Jensen incidentally remarks (*ibid.* 584, n. 1): "The Gilgamesh-legend came to Israel at any rate in much the same form in which we know it in Assyria and Babylonia," this is (in view of his other expositions of the subject) to be taken with a grain of salt, or all the emphasis must be laid on the word "came." Cp., further, Schneider, "Zwei Aufsätze zur Religionsgeschichte Vorderasiens," *Leipz. semit. Studien*, v. 1, 1909, 42 ff.

[3] *Keilinschriften*, 582; *Lit. Zentralblatt*, 1906, 1712 ff.

[4] "Jesus u. Gilgamesch," *Christl. Welt*, 1907, 193 ff.; *Theol. Jahresber. f.* 1906, 223.

[5] *Ibid.* 14.

[6] *Völkerpsychologie*, ii. 3, 1909, 525, n. 1, 528 ff.

the disagreeable truth to death, to poison it clandestinely, or silence it with a stony silence."[1] I shall, on the contrary, submit it to a detailed investigation, and although only the Synoptists are primarily involved, I shall not disregard the Gospel of John: for the "mythographers," according to Jensen, must both have drawn from the supposed source. But, first of all, though there have already been several references to the Epic of Gilgamesh, I shall give a summary of its contents, that is to say, so far as these are still discernible.[2]

After an introductory description of the hero, the Epic gives an account of his tyrannical rule in Erech. His subjects in despair call upon the gods, who bid the great Aruru create one who will be the counterpart of Gilgamesh, and with whom he may vie. Such is the origin of Eabani—the name is uncertain—whose whole body is covered with hair, who has hair on his head like a woman's, whose clothing is like that of the god of herds and meadows, *i.e.* is probably made of the skins of animals: "*eating herbs with gazelles, drinking from a trough with cattle, sporting with the creatures of the waters.*" A hunter, whose connexion with the other characters of the Epic is not yet quite clear,[3] is interfered with by Eabani in the exercise of his calling, and accordingly, on the advice of his father and of Gilgamesh, takes out with him to the cattle-trough a female hierodoulos, who entices Eabani into her toils, and brings him to Erech. Gilgamesh has previously dreamed about him, and the two now contract a friendship. Eabani, it is true, returns once more to the desert, but is persuaded by the sun-god to come back, being reminded of the fare which he has enjoyed in Erech, and of the prospects of royal honours which again await him there. Then he has one or two dreams, the meaning of which is uncertain. What follows also is not clear; but, at any rate, Gilgamesh with Eabani now takes the field

[1] *Gilgameschepos*, i. xiv.

[2] Cp., further, Jensen, *Assyr. u. bab. Mythen u. Epen*, 1900, 116 ff., 421 ff.; *Gilgameschepos*, i. 2 ff.

[3] What is said on this subject, *ibid.* 109 f., is connected with the whole astronomical interpretation of the myth, which need not be examined here.

against Humbaba, and his mother implores the sun-god that he may have the victory. Eabani is filled with alarm, but Gilgamesh reassures him, and finally—the details are again uncertain—they overcome Humbaba, and bring his head to Erech. Here Ishtar makes a proposal to Gilgamesh, but he repels her thus: "*Who is thy consort, whom thou wilt love for all coming time? Who is thy shepherd-boy, who will always be dear to thee? . . . Tammuz, the consort of thy youth, thou causedst to weep every year. When thou didst love the bright-coloured shepherd-boy-bird, thou didst strike him and break his pinions. . . . When thou didst love the lion of perfect strength, thou didst dig seven and seven pits for him. When thou didst love the horse, superior in the fray, with whip and spur thou didst urge him on. . . . When thou didst love the shepherd of the herd . . . thou didst strike him and transform him into a fierce dog. . . . When thou didst love Ishullanu, thy father's gardener . . . thou didst lift up thine eyes to him . . . Ishullanu says to thee: 'Of me, what desirest thou of me? . . .' When thou heardest these his words, thou didst strike him and transform him. . . . Me also, me wilt thou love and make like those.*"[1] Ishtar accordingly mounts to heaven, and ultimately induces Anu to create a heavenly bull, which is let loose upon Gilgamesh. But he slays it after a fierce combat, and when Ishtar raises cries of woe, Eabani throws the right shoulder of the bull at her, and calls out: "*If I caught thee also and did to thee as I have done to him, I should hang his entrails by thy side.*" Then Eabani has again a dream, which he relates to his friend; but thereafter he dies, and is mourned by Gilgamesh for six days. Once more there is a passage of dubious meaning: ultimately we find Gilgamesh on his way to his ancestor Utnapishtim or Atarachasis[2]-Xisuthros[3] in order to inquire of him how he too can escape death. The journey is long and difficult: in the end, however, Gilgamesh comes to the goddess Siduri-Sabītu, who lives on the sea-

[1] Jensen, *Mythen*, 169, 171.

[2] For the reading of the name, cp. Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 552, n. 2; Jensen, *Gilgameschepos*, i. 24, n. 6.

[3] In the following pages I shall use this form, since Jensen as a rule adheres to it and I must sometimes quote from him: and, further, different names would only confuse the reader.

shore, and after protracted negotiations she shows him the way to the ferryman of Xisuthros. The ferryman, after cutting down one or more trees and making one or more boat-poles with them, brings him in three days to the waters of death, and the adventure now becomes dangerous. "Gilgamesh must seize the boat-poles, perhaps to prevent the boat from running aground: but we cannot be certain whether the ferryman gives him the order a hundred and twenty times till Gilgamesh perhaps has broken a hundred and twenty boat-poles, or whether the command has to be given for a hundred and twenty days in succession because they have to exert themselves so long. Finally, the last or the *only* boat-pole breaks in two, and now, it appears, the crisis of the peril is reached. Gilgamesh loosens his girdle, and sets his hand to some process at the mast. It may be that he wishes to unfurl the sail—but of what use would that be against so strong a current? It is more probable that he takes hold of the mast or lifts it from its place in order that it may support him if the vessel should be wrecked or sink."[1] At all events he ultimately reaches the abode of Xisuthros, and receives from his lips first of all a general account of the destiny of man after death; then, when Gilgamesh asks how Xisuthros, who also was at one time man, has been received into the company of the gods, he is told the familiar story of the Deluge. The following part is again not altogether lucid. Gilgamesh falls into a deep slumber, but is aroused by Xisuthros, who lays before him seven loaves with the words, "*Gilgamesh, number thy loaves.*" Xisuthros then reproves his ferryman and bids him conduct Gilgamesh to the place of purification, that he may cleanse himself and put on new garments. This is done: Xisuthros instructs him how to find a magic herb, which can perhaps rejuvenate man: but on the way back it is snatched from him by a serpent. Then he journeys farther on foot and returns to Erech, enters into communication with the spirit of Eabani, and receives from it that information regarding the realm of the dead which has already been quoted on p. 169. And here the Epic in the form in which it is preserved to us comes to an end.

[1] Jensen, *Gilgameschepos*, i. 32 f.

The reader probably fails to understand at first how the origin of the Gospel narrative is to be found here. Jensen to some extent achieves his result only by first deriving a number of Old Testament characters from this Epic, and by then tracing Jesus, John, and Lazarus back to these. We must, therefore, give some consideration to his treatment of the Old Testament characters, but it is, of course, impossible in these pages to examine it thoroughly.

"Elijah," says Jensen,[1] ". . . lives . . . in solitude and concealment by the brook Cherith . . . to the East of Jordan, and ravens bring him his food. He is a hairy man, and has a girdle of (leather or) skin about his loins. In external appearance, therefore . . . he is in some degree comparable to Eabani, whose whole body was covered with hair . . . and . . . who was probably clothed in skins. Like Elijah at the beginning (?) of the story, Eabani also lives in solitude at the beginning of *his* story, and, what is more, he lives in the desert: and the ravens that minister to Elijah remind one of the beasts with which Eabani lives in the desert." But all this is debatable; and the further story of Elijah contains still less of a real parallel to the Epic of Gilgamesh. Thus far, then, it is unwarrantable to derive the prophet John in the wilderness beside (or, according to Jn 1^{38} 10^{40}, East of) Jordan from Eabani. For, as Jensen himself says, his hairy raiment does not remind us of Elijah, who wore none, but is a mark of the prophet (Zec 13^{4}); the leathern girdle is *perhaps* not at all an original feature, and the similarity between אַרְבֶּה (locusts) and עֹרְבִים (ravens) cannot prove anything either. Another line of argument is equally unsuccessful. It takes this form: (1) that John according to Lk 1^{15} is to drink no wine [Lk 7^{33}—which Jensen also cites, and at the same time associates with the statement that Eabani eats grass and herbs with the beasts—really refers to fasting]; (2) that abstinence from wine is a characteristic of Samson and Samuel [or rather of the mother of Samson, while the mother of Samuel only denies that *she has* drunk wine or strong drink]; (3) that Samson and Samuel also had their hair unshorn, and are bound for this

[1] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 579.

reason to be Eabanis. Of course, for other reasons as well, which are not more conclusive. For if their birth is announced to (or craved on behalf of) their mothers, previously barren, by an angel or priest on the occasion of a sacrifice, this has clearly little to do with the circumstance that Eabani is created at the entreaties of the inhabitants of Erech—"and such entreaties would presumably be backed by offerings"[1]—and created at the command of the gods by the goddess Aruru. But even apart from this, corresponding circumstances in the case of John cannot be read out of Luke's narrative regarding *his* birth. Jensen's arguments are again quite insufficient. That Zacharias at the vision of the angel should be filled with fear, "and with fear one can lose the power of speech,"[2] has little or nothing to do with the miracle of fire which Abraham (Gn 15), Moses (Ex 3), Gideon, and Samson's father witness, and would in any case prove nothing, since the origination of this incident in the legend of Gilgamesh is not made even plausible in any way. The same remark must be made regarding the similarity of the name of John's mother and Eleazar's (Ex 6^{23}), or of the name of John himself and the father (!) of Azarias in the Book of Tobit—more especially as the Eabani-like character of these various personages is only asserted, not proved. When Jensen finally ventures the thesis that perhaps "the Eabani of the Jesus-legend did not wear his hairy garment *because* he was a prophet, but was a prophet because he wore . . . a hairy garment or skins,"[3] it is but right, in view of the testimony of Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 5. 2), that he should ask himself whether this feature, at any rate, viz. John's prophetic work, is not in correspondence with facts. Jensen's view of the matter we shall discover on a later page.

In the meantime he continues his examination of the "Jesus-legend," and decides that the baptism of Jesus by John (like the anointing of Saul by Samuel, and of Elisha by Elijah) is modelled upon the royal honours rendered to Eabani by Gilgamesh. He must, however, admit that "Gilgamesh causes royal honours to be paid to Eabani, but it is not Saul who . . . anoints Samuel . . . to be king, but Samuel Saul;

[1] Jensen, *Gilgameschepos*, i. 710. [2] *Ibid.* 815. [3] *Ibid.* 818.

and so, too, Elijah anoints Elisha,"[1] and John baptizes Jesus. This exchange of functions is said to occur elsewhere, although, in truth, it exposes the inherent improbability of the whole hypothesis. For Jensen's succeeding argument is not at all cogent. John announces Jesus' coming because Gilgamesh dreams of Eabani before his arrival—but this saying of John's regarding the "mightier than he" originally does not at all refer to Jesus, but to the Messiah in general! Further, Jensen himself admits that it is merely a conjecture that those dreams occur a day before Eabani's arrival, and that it is merely possible that Jesus (in Jn 1^{29}) for this reason comes to John on the day after John's declaration: "for a statement of time, such as 'on the following day,' is often made, particularly in the Gospel of John, without being derived from the original legend."[2]

Is Jesus then a Gilgamesh in any other respect? Jensen apparently explains even the name Jesus on the principle that wherever the name Joshua occurs in the Old Testament, it betokens Gilgamesh. But is there any other point of similarity between this alleged form of the Israelitish Gilgamesh-legend and the story of Jesus? In the same way, when it is declared that a prophetess Anna appears at the presentation in the temple merely because the mothers of Samuel and Tobias bear that name, and the former of these is an Eabani and the latter a Gilgamesh, the question has to be asked, Why then is the *mother* of Jesus not called Anna?

After being baptized by John, Jesus disappears into the wilderness, there experiences hunger and is tempted by the devil; all this reminds Jensen of Eabani's flight to the desert, in the course of which he *perhaps* (for the meaning of the fragmentary line seems to me rather obscure) complains of hunger, and is comforted by the sun-god. That is to say, the proposal that Jesus should cast Himself from the pinnacle of the temple is derived from an earlier and more primitive form of this part of the Jesus-legend; and, as we discover from an offshoot of this form which has been preserved in the legend of Buddha, that more primitive form represented Him as wishing for death like a despondent Eabani. On

[1] Jensen, *Gilgameschepos*, i. 821. [2] *Ibid.* 940.

the other hand, the proposal that He should eat, and that He should receive from the devil all the kingdoms of the world, is explained by Jensen principally by the reference which the sun-god makes to the fare which Eabani enjoyed in Erech, and to the honours which there awaited him. Again, the sun-god is identified also with the Spirit of God, which descends upon Jesus (before this time, however, viz. on the occasion of His baptism), and declares Him to be His Son, drives Him into the wilderness, and, according to Lk 4^{14}, subsequently inspires Him. This whole construction is made none the more plausible by the fact that again we have several Old Testament narratives explained in the same way: indeed, the identification of the sun-god simultaneously with the Spirit and the devil shows very clearly, I think, the impossibility of the whole theory.

But after explaining Jesus' return to Galilee and (according to Lk 4^{16}) to Nazareth, as well as His second encounter with the Baptist (Jn $1^{35ff.}$), as derived from Eabani's return to the town of Gilgamesh, Jensen believes that "the time has now come to declare that we have . . . no longer to do with a *hypothesis* of a Jesus-Gilgamesh-legend, but with a *fact*. Consequently . . . it is no longer a question of procuring new proofs of the statement that the Jesus-legend which has so far been analysed above, is a Gilgamesh-legend, but only of demonstrating *whether* and *how* it manifests itself in that main portion of the Jesus-legend which has not yet been discussed."[1] For my part, I fear that when we are studying the rest of Jensen's exposition it will be our chief business to discover whether the *proof* for the theory, hitherto lacking, has at any point been supplied.

Such proof I cannot find in the attempts which Jensen makes, to read out of the Old Testament some forms of the Gilgamesh-legend that differ from the Babylonian forms, and then from these to derive specific features of the story of Jesus. For example, it seems to me not to be proved that in the alleged Old Testament form of the Gilgamesh-legend the Deluge and the calamities preceding it were inserted before the expedition against Humbaba, and inserted as incidents in

[1] Jensen, *Gilgameschepos*, i. 835.

the life of the hero. Still, this episode might even then have influenced the story of Jesus' life in some way: are there clear evidences of it? According to Jensen we find "after Jesus' return from the wilderness as close a reflex of the Deluge . . . as the situation appears to permit: just as Xisuthros on the evening before the Deluge," in order to escape from it, "goes on board his vessel in which he and his household experience the violent storm, so Jesus one evening embarks with his disciples in a boat kept ready for him, in order to cross to the other side of the Sea of Galilee" and "to escape the molestation of the people." "To the Babylonian story of the Deluge belong the destruction of all humankind and the demolition of their homes": "Jesus . . . predicts a dreadful judgment not only upon the towns of Chorazin and Bethsaida, but also upon the town of Capernaum."[1] The fact that we are not also informed of their destruction is explained by Jensen as meaning that they were still in existence at the time when our Jesus-legend came into being; but in that case would *they* have been specially selected as the Deluge-towns of Jesus when they had so little claim to be thus described? Further, the statement that the two thousand swine of the Gerasenes correspond to the human race perishing in the waters of the Flood looks rather like a pointless jest. And yet Brückner holds that in this very incident "legend has undoubtedly exercised a certain influence,"[2] while Beer thinks himself bound to admit "that in the story of Jesus' voyage and His miraculous stilling of the tempest an echo of the Babylonian story of the Deluge may be traced."[3]

The further parallels which Jensen discovers are also very far-fetched. Jesus at the time of His settlement in His "Deluge-town," Capernaum, (an incident first related by Matthew) is now a Xisuthros. Jensen accordingly associates the sermon reported from Capernaum regarding the nearness of the Kingdom of God, with the exercise of the kingly power which the god Tishhu, "the washed one, *i.e.* a kind of Christ,"[4] receives after slaying Labbu (*i.e.* probably a

[1] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 835, 837 f.
[2] *Christl. Welt*, 1907, 202.
[3] *Theol. Jahresber.*, 1906, 14.
[4] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 845.

lion).[1] Only it is unfortunate that, as we have seen above (p. 152, n. 3), this identification is questionable: the slayer of Labbu may also be Bel-Marduk. Further, Jensen[2] says: "According to II R 57. 35, Tishhu is a name of Ninib in his character as ramku, *i.e.* washed one, elsewhere = priest, or as the god of self-cleansing"; the resemblance to Christ appears therefore to be rather uncertain. Finally, so far as I can discover, there is absolutely no proof that Labbu is a "plague" that appeared before the Deluge. In the texts already referred to (p. 122), which are supposed to contain parallel recensions of the account of the Deluge, we read, no doubt, of a threefold famine preceding the Deluge, and of a pestilence: but in the Epic of Gilgamesh, Ea speaks only these words to Bel: "*Rather than that thou hadst brought on a deluge, I* WOULD *that a lion or a savage dog* HAD *come and diminished mankind: I* WOULD *that there* HAD *been famine, or that Ira* HAD *come and wasted the land*"[3]—and there is nothing at all in the relative texts to suggest that, like the famine in that recension, the lion and Ira had really distressed the country before the Deluge. It is equally impossible to draw conclusions from incidents in the Old Testament that are alleged to have been influenced by this enlarged Deluge-legend or Gilgamesh-legend.

But if it should be said that then the myth of Labbu may by itself have influenced the story of Jesus, we must reply that the similarity is too insignificant for that. For even Jesus' statement in Lk 10^{18}, that He saw Satan falling from heaven, and His casting forth an unclean spirit immediately after His first proclamation of the Kingdom of God (Mk $1^{21ff.}$), have nothing to do with the victory of the Babylonian god over Labbu. Still less has this victory any connexion with Jn $1^{35ff.}$, where the Baptist virtually transfers his office to Jesus, and one of his first disciples at once recognizes Jesus as the Messiah, and another as the Son of God and King of Israel.

The Humbaba-combat of the two friends Jensen then identifies with Jesus' first visit to Jerusalem as narrated in

[1] *Mythen*, 44 ff.; cp. *Gilgameschepos*, i. 56 ff.
[2] *Mythen*, 365.
[3] *Ibid.* 243.

the Fourth Gospel—an incident which accordingly ranks as an early and integral part of the Jesus-legend—and more definitely with the purification of the temple, which has therefore been put in its proper place by John. All this, however, presupposes that Jerusalem is the "Humbaba-town of Jesus"; but even if this be granted there would be little or no resemblance discoverable between the events compared. Besides, the combat with Humbaba is waged by Gilgamesh and Eabani: in the journey to Jerusalem Jesus has no companion.

The expedition against Humbaba is followed by the scene between Gilgamesh and Ishtar, in which "he enumerates to her the names of those whom she has loved (six in all) and thereafter ruined—the last of whom has disdained her love." "From this it may be at once inferred," says Jensen,[1] "who the woman of Samaria is whom Jesus-Gilgamesh meets near Sychar after his Humbaba-episode—whom he informs to her astonishment that she has already had five husbands, and that the sixth whom she now has is not her husband, and to whom he further (?) relates all that she has done: it is the amorous Ishtar." Here we have really a scene—the only one, I must say, as we shall discover—in which one *might* for a moment suppose that there has been some borrowing from the Epic of Gilgamesh. For there have been other attempts, though for inadequate reasons, to find some special explanation for the woman's five husbands; but the gods of the five peoples which established themselves as the successors of the Ten Tribes were (at any rate according to 2 K $17^{30f.}$) seven in number. Could not therefore the woman's five husbands perhaps correspond to Ishtar's? But Jensen's exposition which has just been restated, and still more the words of the Epic as cited on p. 269, show that we have to do not with five, but with six husbands whom Ishtar has had: she has already transformed Ishullanu also, and he is therefore no more her husband. Even here, accordingly, where at the first blush one might most readily suppose it, there is no real similarity.

Since Jesus is described as resting at the well, Jensen

[1] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 950 f.

further associates the story with Eabani's encounter with the female hierodoulos at the cattle-trough, and asserts, besides, that this episode was also the basis of the narrative of the marriage at Cana—a story which in its original form, he says, describes the marriage of Jesus with Mary the sister of Martha. The proof for this is again derived from alleged Gilgamesh-myths in the Old Testament, and is therefore not at all convincing: but I wished to put this argument before the reader in order to show what kind of conclusions Jensen occasionally reaches by this procedure.

When, on the other hand, he finds traces of the scene between Gilgamesh and Ishtar in the Baptist's rebuke of the marriage of Antipas, and traces also of the captivity of Ishullanu and the death of Eabani in the Baptist's imprisonment and execution, this is again only possible by making a detour round by the Old Testament—in other words, it is impossible. It would force one to suppose that the Gospel of John is right when in 3^{24} it represents the seizure of the Baptist as taking place only after Jesus' first visit to Jerusalem: for this corresponds to the Humbaba-episode, and that episode precedes the scene with Ishtar and the incidents ensuing. But, more than this, the well-known account which Josephus gives of the Baptist would have to be accounted spurious—which is surely unwarrantable.

The statements of the Synoptists that Jesus sends out His twelve disciples, then after their return withdraws along with them to a desert place, there feeds the five thousand, goes up into a mountain, walks upon the water, lands in Gennesaret, and meets the Syrophoenician woman, are again, with the help of the Old Testament, very ingeniously but unnaturally derived (or not derived) from the Epic of Gilgamesh. It is particularly suspicious that the second story of feeding the multitude, which certainly is only a variant of the first, is traced not to it alone, but chiefly to the seven loaves which Xisuthros (!) puts before Gilgamesh. His words, "*Number thy loaves,*" are said to be the source also of Jesus' mention of the seven loaves with which He had fed four thousand (Mk 8^{20}, Mt 16^{10}), and of the discourse on the Bread of Life in Jn 6: and the complaint of Gilgamesh, "*What am I to do, Utnapishtim,*

where am I to go?"—is similarly the basis of Peter's question (Jn 6^{68}), "*Lord, to whom shall we go?*" "The question asked in perplexity and despair has thus in John's Gospel become the question of assured trustfulness."[1] On such principles one can obviously explain anything. There is more to be said for the theory that Jesus' announcement of His sufferings has arisen from the remainder of Gilgamesh's lament, and from the information which Xisuthros communicates, although in that case Jesus has to represent at once Gilgamesh and Xisuthros; but it is again quite unnatural to derive the reproof addressed to Peter (Mk 8^{33}), "*Get thee behind me* (*ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου*), *Satan*," the saying in Jn 6^{70} "*And one of you is a devil*," and the statement, which occurs, it is true, just before the confession of Peter (Jn 6^{66}), "*Upon this many of his disciples went back*" (*ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω*)—all from the words with which Xisuthros rebukes his ferryman.

The Transfiguration after six or eight days, probably therefore after a week of seven days (!),[2] as well as the saying of Jesus, Jn 7^{34} (cp. 8^{21}): "*Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me: and where I am, ye cannot come*"—and, finally, His ascension, are traced to the cleansing and fresh apparelling of Gilgamesh; but collaterally also to the apotheosis and removal of Xisuthros on the *seventh* day after his landing on the mount of the Deluge (and that landing takes place *seven* days after the commencement of the Deluge). Again, Jesus' praying is said to correspond to the sacrifice offered by Xisuthros, and the voice from heaven (even that of Jn 12^{28}) to the declaration of Bel: "*Now shall Utnapishtim and his wife be as gods.*" The insertion of this "episode of the Deluge-mount" is, according to Jensen, partly due to the fact that in it—only, however, in its Pentateuchal form—there is a reference to a transfiguration, just as there is a reference to a purification and a fresh apparelling in the first-mentioned passage from the Epic of Gilgamesh: it is partly also due to this other reason, that this episode itself at one time contained a purification. For (he says) the Old Testament Gilgamesh-legends point to this, and accordingly we must

[1] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 961. [2] *Ibid.* 880.

trace to it (*i.e.* to this episode of the Deluge-mount) the narrative of the Washing of Feet, in which Peter plays the part of Xisuthros, and similarly the story (in Jn 9) of the healing of the blind man, who has to *wash* himself in the Pool of Siloam. If the question is asked, finally, why various sayings of Jesus are said to have been uttered during a sojourn of His at Jerusalem which is not mentioned in the Synoptic Gospels, and is, besides, not to be derived from the Epic of Gilgamesh, Jensen has his answer ready. "On the Mount of Transfiguration, Peter and the other two disciples wish to build tabernacles"—and this is again to be traced to Gilgamesh's felling of trees before his voyage to Xisuthros—: "when Jesus in Jerusalem announces that he will withdraw from men's sight, the Feast of the building of booths, the Feast of Tabernacles, is being celebrated. . . . The result of this is the following: . . . out of Peter's proposal (mentioned by our Synoptic Gospels) that he with the other disciples should build tabernacles, the Johannine legend has evolved a Feast of Tabernacles. But the Law prescribed that every male Jew should go up to Jerusalem to celebrate this feast. Accordingly Jesus must undergo his 'transfiguration' in Jerusalem, and thus he arrives there so much before the time. When, therefore, Peter expresses the intention of building tabernacles with the other disciples because Gilgamesh . . . fells a tree or trees, this is the ultimate reason of Jesus' premature arrival in Jerusalem."[1] Jensen himself closes this disquisition with a note of exclamation: hence I have nothing to add.

The scene with the magic herb he recognizes in the story of the fish with the shekel in its mouth, and at the same time in the story of the miraculous draught of fishes in Lk 5 and Jn 21. But besides, he says, this last narrative has also been influenced by the voyage of Gilgamesh to Xisuthros and his stay with him. That is to say, Xisuthros is here again represented by Jesus, Gilgamesh by Peter. "Gilgamesh before landing at Xisuthros' dwelling unfastens his girdle, and in the same way Peter proceeds . . . at any rate to do something to his girdle. If thereafter he does not unfasten

[1] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 968 f.

it, but *girds it about him*, that looks like a deviation from the original." [1] In other words, it does not harmonize with the theory: and is the rest more fortunate? "The seven loaves in the Epic of Gilgamesh are intended for Gilgamesh alone . . . Jesus . . . who . . . takes the place of Xisuthros, himself prepares a meal consisting of bread and a fish, and sets it before seven of his disciples. Seven loaves of bread for one person have apparently become bread for seven persons." [2] On these principles any two things that at all resemble one another may be derived one from the other. Finally, the prophecy addressed to Peter and the disciple whom Jesus loved, is said to come from the announcement made to Gilgamesh regarding his death, and the narrative which Xisuthros relates of his removal from among men. "However," such is the objection which Jensen raises against himself, "the immortal one to whom Gilgamesh refers is also he whom he addresses, viz. Xisuthros; but the disciple whom Jesus loves, of whom Peter speaks, is different from the man to whom he speaks, and is no Xisuthros. . . . Does that mean that from the dialogue between Xisuthros and Gilgamesh in the Israelitish form of the legend a totally new figure has been evolved? In point of fact this is apparently the case. But probably the Gospel of John teaches us something different. In the boat in which Peter is found before he (*i.e.* Gilgamesh) swims to Jesus (*i.e.* Xisuthros), there are in addition six other disciples, among them the disciple beloved by Jesus-Gilgamesh, the Xisuthros of his Xisuthros-Gilgamesh-episode: but in the boat in which Gilgamesh makes the voyage to Xisuthros, there is in addition to himself the ferryman of Xisuthros, the only man who was removed with him to the West, who was therefore certainly an intimate friend of Xisuthros. And this ferryman, like Xisuthros himself, became immortal. Therefore we now probably know to whom the intimate friend of Jesus (as Xisuthros) corresponds, the friend over whom, in the first instance at any rate, death is perhaps to have no power: it is the ferryman, the immortal comrade of Xisuthros! And we now understand why this companion in particular must first recognize him and say to Peter (as a Gilgamesh)

[1] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 1001 f. [2] *Ibid.* 1002.

that the man standing on the shore (as a Xisuthros) is Jesus: for the ferryman knows Xisuthros, but Gilgamesh his companion does not."[1] Indeed Jensen, on the presupposition that the beloved disciple is Andrew, believes that he can prove the foregoing identification from the legend of Alexander and an Arabian legend of Moses. For Alexander's cook, whose name is Andrew, can be identified with the servant of Moses: but he in turn corresponds to the ferryman of Xisuthros. The proof of all this has not yet been put forward by our author: and even that proof would carry conviction only if a relationship really existed between the two Andrews, and if the one named in the Gospels were really the beloved disciple: but this in my opinion is certainly controvertible. Indeed, not to dwell on these arguments, the whole of this highly artificial explanation rests on the assumption that the ferryman of Xisuthros became immortal: but only Berosus (in Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schöne, i. 22) betrays any knowledge of this. Even if the similarity between the Epic and Jn 21 were greater, the question would still arise how this chapter occurs precisely where it does, and why the draught of fishes, which ought to correspond to the *later* procuring of the magic herb, *precedes* the incident in which Jesus, Peter, and the beloved disciple take part. The answer which Jensen in the first instance gives to this question is entirely unsatisfactory. "The reason for the transposition and for a consequent fusion of the draught of fishes with the 'landing at Xisuthros' house' was probably this, that the situation in both parts of the story was similar from the outset: in both there were on one occasion disciples of Jesus in a boat near the shore and Jesus near them. Besides, the draught of fishes could suggest the meal after the landing, at which [but why?] a fish is eaten."[2] The remainder, however, is supposed to have stood originally at various places in chap. 6 ff. and 12, after the story of Jesus' sudden appearance to His disciples on the water, and to have been transferred to chap. 21 because mention was there also made of Jesus' appearance to His disciples, from whom He had previously been separated. "Thus appearances of the risen Jesus have

[1] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 1005 f. [2] *Ibid.* 1013.

converted this episode also into a post-resurrection appearance; and both this incident, and in connexion with it the succeeding one, have been transferred to a time subsequent to the last Christophany otherwise attested."[1] Will any one be convinced by these arguments?

But still more unfortunate is the attempt to discover the summoning of the spirit of Eabani in the parable of the Rich Man (Lk $16^{19ff.}$), and in the raising of Lazarus. Jensen is intrepid enough to compare the request of Dives that Lazarus be sent to his brethren, with Gilgamesh's desire to obtain through Eabani positive knowledge regarding the afterlife; and similarly to compare the thrice repeated description of Abraham as father, with the appeal addressed to father Bel, father Sin, father Ea (previously also, we must add, to a goddess Ninsun) by Gilgamesh. On the other hand, the fundamental difference between the "beggar" Lazarus and Eabani, *the powerful, the great offspring, a legion of Ninib*,[2] he seeks to explain in the first instance only by treating poverty and chronic disease as a "secondary acquisition." And certainly that is better than if he had identified the cattle among which Eabani satisfies his hunger, with the dogs that lick Lazarus' sores; better, too, than when he actually derives his disease from the name which John gives to [the other] Lazarus' place of residence, Bethany, which, Jensen says, may be explained as "house of a sufferer." But further, the raising of Lazarus cannot be derived from the summoning of Eabani, and is therefore explained as an exaggerated form of the original legend: in other words, the theory again fails to answer. Finally, we have seen on an earlier page that the Baptist is supposed to represent Eabani: but how can he have "taken the place of" Lazarus and still allowed Lazarus to remain? So at this point also the whole theory falls to pieces.

The Epic of Gilgamesh in its present form finishes with the conjuration of the spirit of Eabani: Jensen, however, seeks to derive in great measure from the same source the portions of the four Gospels that follow the narratives hitherto considered, *i.e.* the story of the Passion and Resurrec-

[1] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 1019. [2] *Mythen*, 121.

tion. This is in part done indirectly with the aid of the Old Testament, a method which is no more successful than before—in part also directly, to this extent at least, that the relative passages are described as originally occurring at another point. Thus, for example, the entry into Jerusalem is said to correspond to Eabani's entry into Erech; and for this reason Jesus' going to Bethany (which in the Synoptists follows the entry, and which is followed by His hungering, Mk 11^{12}, Mt 21^{18}), corresponds to Eabani's flight to the wilderness, after which he also complains of hunger; and further, the feast at which Mary anoints Jesus—an incident which in John follows His coming to Bethany—and therefore, also the anointing by the "sinner," Lk $7^{36ff.}$, and His stay with Mary and Martha, Lk $10^{38ff.}$, correspond to Eabani's connexion with the female hierodoulos. Jensen refuses to understand the word ἁμαρτωλός in the sense usually and properly given to it. On the other hand, he says: "A trace . . . of what was at one time a more intimate relationship between Jesus (or the Jesus of the primitive legend) and Mary and Martha can undoubtedly be found in his friendship with them: and an indication of the fact that the feast at Bethany is held in honour of the marriage of Jesus and Mary, may be seen in the attitude of Mary, who sits or kneels at his feet while Martha serves at table."[1] As Jensen can see nothing but legend in the Gospel portrait of Jesus, indignation would be out of place; but what is one to say to such reasoning?

Again, the eschatological discourse is said to be derived from the "lion-plague" and the appearance of the god who perhaps descends upon the cloud from heaven;[2] the Lord's Supper, at which a new covenant is concluded, and the prayer in Gethsemane, from the last sacrificial meal of Xisuthros; the farewell discourses and the new commandment which Jesus gives at the last supper, from the exhortation to piety which Xisuthros gives his companions, as Berosus (in Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schöne, i. 22) relates. One might, with equal justice, make many another identification.

The apprehension of Jesus is explained by Jensen as a disastrous Humbaba-combat, and His trial as a combat with

[1] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 981.

[2] Cp. p. 152 above.

the celestial bull (together with what precedes this in the Epic of Gilgamesh)—but only because Jensen believes that he is forced to explain many Old Testament narratives in this way. Substantiation for this there is none, and, besides, the whole theory has to face the objection "that Humbaba, to whom Gilgamesh is betrayed, and Anu, to whom subsequently the goddess Ishtar complains of Gilgamesh's blasphemy, would be represented by the same persons, namely, the high-priest or high-priests, the elders, and the scribes."[1] Jensen, who at first regards this as no serious difficulty, finally replies: "The original sequel of the treachery practised on Jesus (as a Gilgamesh) in a Humbaba-episode, etc., is not the examination before the high-priest and the false charge of blasphemy, nor the maltreatment before the Sanhedrin—for this must be a reflex of the bull-episode—but it is the execution of Jesus on the actual ground [*i.e.* asserted to be actual in the legend] that he is Pilate's political opponent; and Pilate, the governor in Jerusalem, is the Humbaba of our Jesus-legend." And further: "The Jesus of the legend, . . . according to its primary form, did not merely claim royal dignity; and originally the inscription on the cross was not intended to deride him; nor does it presuppose, at any rate ultimately, that Jesus was derided. No, the Jesus of the legend stands before Pilate as a king of an earthly kingdom, is crucified by him as a royal adversary, as a Gilgamesh who has gone from North Israel to strive with a Humbaba in South Israel."[2] Here also the tradition is simply twisted into correspondence with the theory.

Jesus' death, resurrection, and ascension are traced to the removal of Xisuthros, and at this point again one must repeat what has been said regarding the apprehension and the trial: the explanation is made possible only by interpreting Old Testament narratives in an impossible way. And so, too, when Jensen tries to account for the present arrangement of all these parts, which is so different from the arrangement one would naturally expect if they are derived from the legend of Gilgamesh. Even in this endeavour Jensen does not achieve entire success: he is forced to explain the story of the sinful

[1] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 915. [2] *Ibid.* 916 f.

woman as borrowed from another Gospel, and as inserted for no reason at a totally unsuitable point. Elsewhere, too, his hypothesis comes short—indeed, it comes short everywhere.

I say nothing of the fact that Jensen would derive from the Gilgamesh legend[1] a number of passages which every tyro in the critical study of the Gospels must recognize to be "secondary." Even if we disregard this objection, there remains not a single instance in which that derivation is demonstrably necessary or even plausible. And even if his argument were convincing, it would not therefore follow that "the whole story of the Gospels is purely legendary."[2] For from the Gilgamesh-legend, or from alleged Israelitish Gilgamesh-legends (which, however, would first have to be explained in detail), one might derive certain features, more or fewer, but certainly not the whole Gospel story, or even discourses like the eschatological and the farewell discourses in John. This would mean only that a few stones had been taken and fitted into the structure of the Gospel narrative by the tradition, a tradition which might be of an entirely different origin and entirely historical: we need not, however, suppose that any such foreign material has anywhere been employed. For if any one should, like Zimmern,[3] be impressed by the number of distant resemblances and the similar order in which such comparable features sometimes appear in the Gospel tradition and in the Epic of Gilgamesh, two considerations must still be urged:

1. Numerous features of the Gilgamesh-legend, to which

[1] That even in the reconstruction of the legend there are many doubtful points, is shown by Bezold (*Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1907, 127 f.), who writes: "Jensen has not borne in mind that the Epic of Gilgamesh is preserved in what is demonstrably a mutilated form, and that new discoveries may modify it in points that are not unessential for his conclusions. In addition to the Epic, he brings within the scope of his investigations other cuneiform texts whose relation to the Epic is by no means clear. No doubt he states in his paraphrase of the text of the Epic and in the two appendixes . . . what solutions, combinations, and identifications are still wholly or partially uncertain: but, as his book proceeds, . . . what has been previously fixed upon as the most certain relatively, is treated as absolutely established."

[2] *Gilgameschepos*, i. 1024.

[3] *Lit. Zentralblatt*, 1906, 1714. Strange as it is, Jensen himself now attaches most weight to this *number* of resemblances; but zero multiplied by a thousand is still zero.

I have in some cases only alluded in the foregoing discussion, are, even according to Jensen, not employed in the Gospel (and Old Testament) tradition: but one cannot discover why a man or a school that dealt so boldly and arbitrarily with derivative material, could not also have remodelled these. If it is said that these features were not known to the man or the school, this is in some cases absolutely impossible—*e.g.* where the legend itself was known, its beginning also must have been known—or on the other hand the problem is not really being faced, and factors of a purely hypothetical nature are being introduced into the discussion.

2. The order in which our Gospels present the various episodes from the life of Jesus is explained, in the case of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, by their two sources, and in these as well as in the Fourth Gospel in quite another and a more natural fashion than Jensen's. Here also, before essaying his task, he has failed to inform himself sufficiently of the results already attained in the study of the Gospels.

Thus his theory, though worked out with great acuteness, is still in every respect a failure; indeed, in its application to Paul, it is wrecked on the historicity of the We-sections in the Acts of the Apostles, which cannot be discredited by Jensen's [1] preposterous assertions. The religious-historical interpretation of the New Testament can learn nothing at all from him: for even his attempted derivation of the conceptions of primitive Christianity from other sources than the Gilgamesh-legend we already found (p. 113) to be unwarranted.[2]

2. Particular Aspects of the Life and Teaching of Jesus.

a. The Stories of the Infancy and Childhood.

Gunkel [3] is not entirely accurate when he says that the central motif of the stories of the infancy is this,

[1] *Moses, Jesus, Paulus*, 1910, 61; *Hat der Jesus der Evangelien wirklich gelebt?* 1910, 7.

[2] Cp. also J. Weiss, *Jesus von Nazareth, Mythus oder Geschichte*, 1910, 53 ff.

[3] *Verständnis*, 65.

"that Jesus is born without a human father, and of a virgin mother, through the mysterious operation of the divine Spirit." As this view is to be found nowhere in the New Testament except in the genealogy furnished in Luke's Gospel (but not until we reach chap. 3), so it is lacking in all other narratives, apart from those which deal with the announcement of Jesus' birth to Joseph and Mary, and again the genealogy in Mt 1. It can hardly be supposed that the mention of Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and Bathsheba among the female ancestors of Jesus (in a very peculiar fashion) was intended as a reply to the calumnies directed against the Virgin Mary; and in Lk 2^5, since it is only in this way that Mary's participation in the journey becomes intelligible, the original statement, I think, was really that Joseph with his *wife* went up to Bethlehem. Indeed, even in the first-named passages there was formerly no mention at all of the Virgin Birth. We still have variant readings to Mt 1^{16} from which it may be inferred that the verse originally did not run: "*Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ,*" but, as the preceding verses and the whole intention of the genealogy require: "*Jacob begat Joseph, and Joseph begat Jesus, who is called Christ.*" In the same way, in Lk 3^{23} "*Jesus was the son* (*as was supposed*) *of Joseph,*" the words in the parenthesis, which have not a secure position in the text, are perhaps for that very reason no part of the original account, just as they are at all events inappropriate to the table of descent.[1] Further, in Mt $1^{21.\ 25}$ there is a reading, particularly in Syriac versions: "*She shall bring* THEE *forth a son: she bare* HIM *a son* (without the preceding phrase, *he knew her not*)"; and this might not only indicate procreation by Joseph, but also be the earlier reading. It is only on this assumption that a proper sense can be found for v.^{20}, where Joseph is called the son of David; and if this be the reading in v.^{25}, the phrase ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν (which

[1] That this does not belong to the original text in Luke and in Matthew, is a totally mistaken hypothesis of Charles, "The New Syriac MS. of the Gospels: St. Matthew $1^{1\text{-}17}$ spurious both on external and internal grounds," *Academy*, 1894, xlvi. 447 f.

is the statement one must expect after the command to Joseph, v.[21], *καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν*), can certainly be referred to Joseph with greater ease. The whole section would therefore be derived from a tradition or source that knew nothing of the Virgin Birth: for the theory that v.[18f.], where it is announced, is only an interpolation in *the text of Matthew*, is not, I think, admissible in view of the unanimous evidence for these verses; still less the theory that the whole paragraph is spurious.[1] Finally, the words of Lk 1[34] "*How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?*"—are simply incomprehensible on the lips of a betrothed maiden (v.[27]): at the announcement, "*Thou shalt conceive*" (v.[31]), she was bound to think of the first son of her marriage. For even the direction here given to *her*: *καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν*, is no counter-argument (at the best it is indefinite enough!), for in the Book of Genesis mothers often give names to children not born to them in virginity: indeed, if the saying had to be understood in this way, then Mary would probably, like Zacharias in v.[20], have been reproved and punished for her unbelief, and at all events in v.[27] have been described as a daughter of David; whereas the actual words are, "*She was betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary.*" This very circumstance also excludes the possibility that *συλλήμψῃ* could mean "thou art now pregnant," as Reitzenstein,[2] Gunkel,[3] and—for extremes often meet—Grützmacher[4] maintain: on the contrary, it may be taken as certain that down to v.[33] one must think of a child born in wedlock, and so v.[34] is most astonishing. And one is equally astonished by the repeated announcement, based on different reasons from that in v.[32], that this child is to be called the Son of God—not because He is the Messiah, as in the previous passage, but because the Holy Ghost would come upon Mary and the power of the Most High would overshadow her. It is not enough, then,

[1] As against Merx, *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien nach ihrem ältesten bekannten Texte*, ii. 1, 1902, 15; L. Köhler, "Zur kanonischen Geburts- u. Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu," *Schweiz. theol. Zeitschr.*, 1902, 226 f.; Usener, "Geburt u. Kindheit Jesu," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1903, 13 f.

[2] *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen*, 117 ff.

[3] *Verständnis*, 67.

[4] *Die Jungfrauengeburt*, 1906, 9 f.

with Kattenbusch,[1] Weinel,[2] L. Köhler,[3] and Petersen,[4] to regard only the words ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω as of later origin; in fact, it is not even adequate, with Hillmann,[5] J. Weiss,[6] H. Holtzmann,[7] Harnack,[8] Grill,[9] O. Pfleiderer,[10] Usener,[11] Spitta,[12] to extend this judgment to v.[34f.]: for although the reference to Elisabeth, who in her old age had also conceived a son (v.[36f.]), could not *in our opinion* make v.[34] any more plausible,[13] still it is more appropriate to v.[34f.] than to v.[31ff.], and must therefore stand or fall with the two preceding verses. As, however, the section is nowhere omitted as a whole, it is not, I think, a later gloss, but the addition made by the Third Evangelist to the material transmitted to him:[14] for, again, it

[1] *Das apostolische Symbol*, ii., 1900, 621.

[2] "Die Auslegung des Apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses von F. Kattenbusch u. die neutestamentliche Forschung," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1901, 37 ff.

[3] *Schweiz. theol. Zeitschr.*, 1902, 221.

[4] *Die wunderbare Geburt des Heilandes*, 1909, 17.

[5] "Die Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu nach Lukas," *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1891, 215 ff.

[6] "Die Evangelien des Markus u. Lukas," in Meyer's *Kommentar über das N.T.* i. (1846), [8]1892, 303; *Die Schriften*, i. 1. 387.

[7] *Neutest. Theologie*, 1897, i. 412 f.

[8] "Das Magnifikat der Elisabeth (Lk 1^{46-55})," *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1900, 541, n. 1; "Zu Lc $1^{34.35}$," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1901, 53 ff.

[9] *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, i., 1902, 330, n. 1.

[10] *Das Urchristentum*, i. 406 ff., 693 [Eng. trans. ii. 101 ff., 506]; *Christusbild*, 12, n. 1 [Eng. trans. 19, n. 1].

[11] Art. "Nativity," *Encycl. Bibl.* iii., 1902, 3349; *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1903, 16.

[12] "Beiträge zur Erklärung der Synoptiker," *ibid.*, 1904, 309.

[13] Cp., however, *Ev. de Nativ. Mariae*, 3: "Sicut ipsa [Maria] mirabiliter ex sterili nascetur, ita incomparabiliter virgo generabit altissimi filium."

[14] Box ("The Gospel Narratives of the Nativity and the Alleged Influence of Heathen Ideas," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1905, 92) adduces for this the following proof also: "The climax of the passage is reached in v.[35] in the words: '*therefore the holy thing which shall be born shall be called Son of God.*' Now it is certainly significant that Luke's genealogy reaches its climax in similar words (Adam the Son of God). The dominant idea of Luke's genealogy lies, it seems to me, in the characteristically Pauline conception that Christ is the second Adam; and that as the first Adam was Son of God by a direct creative act, so also was the second. Thus the genealogy reveals unmistakably the hand of Luke the disciple of Paul, and at the same time guarantees the Lucan character of the alleged interpolation." Loisy (*Revue de l'hist. des rel.*, 1909, lx. 372) appears to me here also to urge as objections to my argument what I had myself stated,

is quite impossible to maintain that no part of the narrative of the infancy belongs to the original account.[1] The Virgin Birth is therefore—and this is the whole point of the foregoing investigation—in Luke's Gospel set forth by a Gentile Christian, in Matthew's by a Jewish Christian, but even in the latter Gospel it seems that we must derive it from Gentile influences. For that it is unhistorical cannot indeed be inferred from the lateness of the readings and passages containing it, but follows, I think, from its inconsistency with Mary's judgment regarding her son, "*He is beside himself*" (Mk 3^{21}), surely a genuine utterance. If, as Grützmacher[2] supposes, the very fact that she had experienced a miracle in regard to Him, had made her expect that He would perform *greater* miracles, and not that He would spend Himself in lowly and continual service, she would surely never have spoken thus: given the miraculous conception, she would never have permitted herself so harsh a judgment regarding her son.[3]

Again, the doctrine can hardly be derived from the passage quoted in Mt 1^{23}, namely, Is 7^{14}, which runs thus in the Septuagint: *ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ λήμψεται καὶ τέξεται υἱόν*: this is as impossible as it is to derive some other ideas still to be mentioned from the passages which are cited as proofs, but which contain not a trace of them.[4] No doubt the passage in Isaiah seems to be clearer: however, so far as I know, it has never been interpreted Messianically by

[1] As against Corssen, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1899, 325; Hilgenfeld, "Die Geburts- u. Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu, Lk 1^{5}–2^{52}," *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1901, 177 ff., 192; L. Köhler, *Schweiz. theol. Zeitschr.*, 1902, 218 ff.; Conybeare, "Ein Zeugnis Ephraems über das Fehlen von c. 1 u. 2 im Texte des Lukas," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1902, 192 ff.; Usener, *ibid.*, 1903, 13 f.

[2] *Jungfrauengeburt*, 17.

[3] H. Latimer Jackson, in a review of my book (*Journal of Theol. Studies*, 1910, xi. 306 f.), objects to this assertion on the ground that in Mark's account the words are only *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ*. But according to v.$^{31f.}$ that expression must certainly mean *His mother* and His brethren. Nor can it be said that His mother need not have concurred in that judgment: for in v.$^{33ff.}$ those who sit around Jesus and do God's will are put also in the place of the mother. Wellhausen [*Das Evangelium Marci* (1903), ^{2}1909, 26], it is true, would read—instead of *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ—οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ*, with the Syriac: but that can hardly be the true reading. Cp., on the other hand, Petersen, *Geburt*, 5 f.

[4] Cp. Weinel, *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1901, 39 f.

Jews.[1] And there are no other indubitable passages[2] which express the anticipation that the Messiah would be born of a virgin: on the contrary, the Virgin Birth was at all events disputed in the second century, since even Aquila, Theodotion, and perhaps Symmachus, in divergence from the ordinary Christian view, render the עַלְמָה of Is 7^{14} by *νεᾶνις*. It would thus seem that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of Jesus can only, in fact, be derived from Gentile influences.

Zimmern,[3] Cheyne,[4] Jeremias,[5] Fiebig,[6] and Petersen[7] refer more definitely to the frequent description of Assyro-Babylonian kings as the sons of the mother-goddess; but, although she was perhaps also described as a virgin,[8] this is obviously something quite different.[9] So, too, with Aelian's

[1] This very simply puts out of court the various attempts to bring the *παρθένος* into agreement with the usual Messianic theology of Judaism.

[2] The fullest statement of these has been compiled by Badham ("Virgo concipiet," *Academy*, 1895, xlvii. 485 f.), who attempts to establish their antiquity, although they are no longer to be found in our editions. Accordingly Box is probably right in rejecting them (*Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1905, 86, n. 2); and Jeremias (*Babylonisches im N.T.*, 1905, 30) should not have cited as ancient the passage (which is not even clear in its meaning) from the Midrash Ekha on La 5^3. In regard to Test. Jos., cp. p. 104 above.

[3] *Keilinschriften*, 379.

[4] *Bible Problems*, 85 ff.

[5] *Babylonisches*, 28 ff.

[6] *Babel u. das N.T.* 10 ff.

[7] *Geburt*, 33. Generally speaking, he gives the fullest account of the parallels.

[8] Cp. Franckh, "Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu Christi im Lichte der altorientalischen Weltanschauung," *Philotesia*, 1907, 213 f.: "None of these personages that play the part of a mother-goddess is thought of as a virgin. It is only in the course of time that Ishtar is everywhere put in the place of the earlier mother-goddesses. . . . As mother-goddess, Ishtar has no male god who permanently corresponds to her. This is the reason why she is vaguely spoken of as the 'virgin' Ishtar. But it must be emphatically asserted that here the idea of virginity undergoes a vague deflection. . . . Certainly it now seems as if Ishtar had been associated with the Zodiacal sign of the Virgo. . . . Through this double process—on the one hand the supersession of other mother-goddesses by Ishtar, for whom there was no fixed male complement, and on the other hand the connexion perhaps established between Ishtar and the Virgo of the Zodiac—we could then understand how perhaps here and there in the 'legend of the kings' also, with its tendency towards the mysterious, the idea of the mother-goddess as 'virgin' could have attained a greater significance."

[9] As Jeremias, *Babylonisches*, 48, and Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, 242 f., point out, Mary, according to Epiphanius, *Haer.* 78 f., was latterly identified with the Asiatic mother-goddess: but this, of course proves nothing for an earlier

statement (*Hist. Anim.* xii. 21)—which has (not very intelligibly) been put alongside of this—that the parents of Gilgamos were a king's daughter and a man of low birth: and the same remark applies to the similar descent of Sargon I.[1] To this we may add that it is difficult to understand how the idea in question should have influenced the New Testament; for, as we have seen, the existence of such an idea in Judaism cannot yet be proved.[2]

One might with less difficulty suppose that the New Testament has been influenced by the North-Arabian cult of Dusares, which Cheyne[3] compares. This cult is described by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 51. 22), and was therefore still in existence at a later period than we are dealing with. But, as Dussaud[4] finally shows, the idea that Dusares was born of a virgin is based on a misunderstanding. Again, should it be true that Tammuz, who according to Jerome (*Ep.* 58. 3, *Opera*, ed. Vallarsi, i. 321) was worshipped in the cave at Bethlehem where the birth of Jesus was said to have taken place, was frequently regarded as the son of Ishtar,[5] still the designation of Ishtar as a virgin would not be a

time. Still less does the fact which the former scholar adduces (following Dupuis), viz. that on a side-door of Notre Dame in Paris, Mary is associated with the signs of the Zodiac!

[1] In regard to the word ênitu (translated Vestal), cp. Franckh, *Philotesia*, 211 f.

[2] This is decisive also against the theory of Egyptian influences, such as are supposed by Issleib (see p. 15, n. 9 above), and more extensively by H. Schneider (*Kultur u. Denken der alten Ägypter*, 1907, 552 f.). Cp., on the other hand, Weinel, *Protestantenblatt*, 1909, 5 f.; Wiedemann, *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1910 348 f.

[3] *Bible Problems*, 73 f.

[4] "Le culte de Dusarès d'après les monnaies d'Adraa et de Bostra," *Revue numismatique*, 1904, 165 f.: "On trouve, dans les inscriptions nabatéennes, mentionné immédiatement après Dusarès, un terme מותבה qu'on a d'abord pris pour un nom divin. M. Nöldeke y a reconnu un attribut de Dusarès et l'on traduit maintenant: Dusarès et son môtab, c'est-à-dire: Dusarès et son trône. Le bronze d'Adraa . . . nous montre distinctement que ce trône était le siège d'un bétyle et consistait en une grande base cubique, une ka'bah diraient les Arabes. Et cette comparaison, qui s'impose, nous explique la méprise dont est victime saint Épiphane lorsqu'il rapporte que la mère de Dusarès était la vierge Κααβοῦ. Le qualificatif de vierge est probablement de son cru, car l'auteur chrétien se préoccupe surtout de montrer l'universalité du culte de la Vierge et du Christ. Il faut biffer cette déesse mère du panthéon nabatéen."

[5] Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 397 ff., certainly says nothing of this.

comparable circumstance: and, besides, Jerome's statement is too late. Though Tammuz was worshipped in the fourth century at Bethlehem, that fact would not explain how ideas regarding him should have influenced Christianity three centuries before.

In another way, again, there is a difference in the Persian notion (which Böklen [1] and Gunkel [2] compare) regarding the birth of Saoshyant and his two precursors. According to it, the seed of Zarathustra is preserved in a certain water in which three young maidens bathe at different times: each of them becomes pregnant, and gives birth to one of these three beings. It is far from comprehensible how one can, even tentatively, compare with this idea the expectation already mentioned (p. 152) that the Messiah would come out of the sea, and suppose that the author of 2 Esdras had imagined the preservation of the seed of David in the same way as the Persians the preservation of the seed of Zarathustra. Further, the Persian view has absolutely no connexion with the idea that the Messiah would be kept a long time in concealment; and, in fact, Böklen himself says, with regard to the first-mentioned parallel: "Only there is thus far a certain difference (!), in that the birth of Christ is traced to the direct operation of divine power—the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*—while the Persian accounts exhibit a coarser and sensual colouring, and invoke the aid of the divine factor only for the miraculous preservation of the seed of Zoroaster, not for the birth of Saoshyant himself!" Thus there is no need to point out that this view, though early, could not have influenced Christianity directly, as one might suppose for reasons that have been repeatedly mentioned. Even in Mandaeism the idea does not linger: for if in Mandaean doctrine water is regarded as procreative in its action,[3] that is something different.

In view of what has been already stated (p. 34 ff.) one must all the more emphasize the difficulty of supposing that Indian influences have affected the New Testament in regard to this or any other matter. Besides, what we find in Indian thought (at any rate in earlier times) is not a Virgin Birth

[1] *Verwandtschaft*, 91 ff. [2] *Verständnis*, 65.
[3] Cp. Brandt, *Mand. Rel.* 67.

in the proper sense of the term, but only a miraculous birth, and one of quite a different type from the birth of Jesus: Buddha, according to the *Lalita Vistara* (6, trad. par Foucaux, i. 53 f.) enters the body of Queen Mâyâ in the form of a young white elephant, and is thus born of her.[1] Thus even Seydel[2] places this in the first of his three classes of parallels, though within that class he reckons it among those instances "in which the later of the comparable narratives may very well have arisen independently; but as there was really something in foreign thought that could have suggested it, its origination, or at any rate its insertion at such and such a point, may have been due to this foreign influence: and in some cases one may readily believe that the one account is modelled upon the other." But in the case before us, is this idea of foreign suggestion really admissible? Seydel[3] supposes that the annunciation to Mary may be traced to that addressed to Mâyâ in the *Rgya tcher rol pa*, the Tibetan edition of the *Lalita Vistara* (trad. par Foucaux, ii. 61, 63);[4] but van den Bergh van Eysinga[5] very properly denies the conclusiveness of the proof. "The similarity is confined . . . to the announcement of the glad news that a future king will be born. There was no need for Luke to borrow this from India: for the Old Testament is acquainted with such announcements in the stories of Isaac and Samson. Luke's representation, besides, is peculiarly Jewish." Nor need one follow Seydel[6] when, assuming the unhistorical

[1] Cp., in detail, de la Vallée-Poussin, "Le bouddhisme et les évangiles canoniques," *Rev. bibl.*, 1906, 372 ff.

[2] *Evangelium*, 300; cp. also O. Pfleiderer, *Urchristentum*, i. 411 f. [Eng. trans. ii. 109]: "At the same time I should like to remark, with reference to all these parallels, that a direct dependence of the one on the other does not seem to be a necessary assumption, since it is much more probable that ancient and widely current myths formed the *common source* from which the materials were taken for the formation of Indian as well as Christian legend." The matter is put differently in *Christusbild*, 26 f., 105 [Eng. trans. 39 f., 155], but similarly, I think, in Gunkel, *Verständnis*, 65.

[3] *Evangelium*, 107 f., 298.

[4] Franke, *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2759, compares, on the other hand, an inscription from Bharaut.

[5] *Einflüsse*, 65; cp. von Hase, *Neutestamentl. Parallelen zu buddh. Quellen*, 1905, 14.

[6] *Evangelium*, 105 ff., 133 ff., 300.

character of the narrative, he regards the royal lineage of Jesus and Elisabeth's salutation of Mary (Lk $1^{39ff.}$) as based upon the very dissimilar homage that was paid to Buddha before his birth.

There is no doubt that the view which we are now discussing, even as it stands in the Gospel of the Jewish-Christian Matthew, would be most easily derived from Greek influences, if it is to be derived at all from the Gentile world: and numerous scholars (Usener,[1] Soltau,[2] Wendland[3]) and theologians (Strauss,[4] Hillmann,[5] J. Weiss,[6] Conybeare,[7] Grill,[8] O. Pfleiderer,[9] Schmiedel,[10] Merx,[11] Gunkel[12]) attempt to trace this view to Greece. Greek influences were actually capable of operating; but if the Christian view had been due to them, one would properly have expected an act of divine procreation, which is not what we find: for even the Spirit in Lk 1^{35} does not take the place of a father, but overshadows Mary in the way in which, according to Mk 9^{7} and par., a cloud overshadows the disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration, or in Ac 5^{15} the shadow of Peter falls upon the sick. Still, this modification of Greek ideas might be explained by the reserve of the Christian narrators. Even with this modification, however, would any one really have transferred to Jesus what the Greeks narrated regarding their heroes and great men? This, I think, we are entitled to suppose only if there is no other interpretation of the tradition possible: and here that is not the case.

When Paul in Gal $4^{23.\ 29}$ and Ro 9^{8} speaks of Ishmael as born after the flesh and Isaac as born through promise or

[1] *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, i., 1889, 70 ff.; *Encycl. Bibl.* iii. 3350 f.; *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1903, 19.

[2] *Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu Christi*, 1902, 22 ff.; *Fortleben*, 77 ff.

[3] In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 127.

[4] *Leben Jesu*, i., 1835, 174 [Eng. trans., *The Life of Jesus*, 1846, i. 180].

[5] *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1891, 231 ff., 257 ff.

[6] *Evangelien des Markus u. Lukas*, 305; *Die Schriften*, i. 1. 218, 387.

[7] "The New Syriac Codex of the Gospels," *Academy*, 1894, xlvi. 535.

[8] *Untersuchungen*, i. 330 ff.

[9] *Urchristentum*, i. 694 f. [Eng. trans. ii. 508 f.]; *Christusbild*, 19 ff. [Eng. trans. 29 ff.].

[10] Art. "Mary," *Encycl. Bibl.* iii. 2964.

[11] *Evangelien*, ii. 1, ix, 17; 2, 1905, 13.

[12] *Verständnis*, 65 f.

after the Spirit, the idea could readily occur to a later writer that the flesh had had nothing at all to do with the begetting of Isaac, in other words, that he was born of a virgin. For it appears that a similar view was really held by Jews in regard to the birth of other patriarchs also. As Conybeare[1] points out, Philo, *De Cher.* 13 f. (ed. Mangey, i. 146 f.) writes thus: *Οἷς ἀρετὴν μεμαρτύρηκεν ὁ νομοθέτης, τούτους γνωρίζοντας γυναῖκας οὐκ εἰσάγει, τὸν Ἀβραάμ, τὸν Ἰσαάκ, τὸν Ἰακώβ, τὸν Μωυσῆν, καὶ εἴτις αὐτοῖς ὁμόζηλος . . . τὴν Σάρραν εἰσάγει τότε κύουσαν, ὅτε ὁ θεὸς αὐτὴν μονωθεῖσαν ἐπισκοπεῖ* (Gn 21^{1}) . . . *γνωριμώτερον δ' ἐπὶ τῆς Λείας ἐκδιδάσκει λέγων, ὅτι τὴν μὲν μήτραν ἀνέῳξεν αὐτῆς ὁ θεός* (29^{31})—*ἀνοιγνύναι δὲ μήτραν ἀνδρὸς ἴδιον. . . πάλιν Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πανσόφου τὸν θεὸν ἱκετεύσαντος, ἐκ τοῦ ἱκετευθέντος ἔγκυος ἡ ἐπιμονὴ Ρεβέκκα γίνεται* (25^{21}). *Χωρὶς δὲ ἱκετείας καὶ δεήσεως τὴν πτηνὴν καὶ μετάρσιον ἀρετὴν Σεπφώραν Μωυσῆς λαβὼν εὑρίσκει κύουσαν ἐξ οὐδενὸς θνητοῦ τὸ παράπαν* (Ex 2^{22}). One sees that Philo makes the wives of the patriarchs represent virtues; but Conybeare, with whom Badham[2] is here in agreement, is probably right in his view that the basis of this allegory is the belief in a virgin birth of the patriarchs, and this belief has probably arisen from the passages cited.[3] Usener,[4] it is true, urges the objection that Philo describes this doctrine as a mystery, in other words, as a truth absolutely new, which broke upon him first in the Hellenistic atmosphere of Alexandria: but this is not correct, for these statements refer to his allegorization of the patriarchs' wives. In that case—and there is no need suddenly to assume the influence of Philo or even of speculations regarding the patriarchs which perhaps existed in other quarters—the idea that Jesus was begotten in virtue of an annunciation and perhaps after the

[1] "The Newly-found Sinaitic Codex of the Gospels," *Academy*, 1894, xlvi. 401, 535; "The New Syriac Gospels," *ibid.*, 1895, xlvii. 150. Carman, "Philo's Doctrine of the Divine Father and the Virgin Mother," *Am. J. of Theol.*, 1905, 491 ff., has only collected all possible passages.

[2] *Academy*, 1895, xlvii. 486.

[3] The corresponding interpretation of Jubil $16^{12f.}$ there given is, however, unwarranted.

[4] *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1903, 19.

Spirit, could well give rise to the notion of the Virgin Birth; and this is the view which H. Holtzmann[1] also accepts.

The narrative regarding the Wise Men from the East and the Massacre of the Innocents at Bethlehem is beset by so many difficulties[2] that it cannot be regarded as historical. But even here the statement that at the birth of Jesus a star appeared, may be explained by a view which we can show to have existed among the Jews, although it came to them ultimately from the Babylonians. As at the birth of Abraham a star was said to have appeared, in the same way (and Nu 24^{17} supplied an additional ground) a similar token was looked for at the birth of the Messiah.[3] On the other hand, the statement in the *Lalita Vistara* which Seydel[4] compares (3, trad. par Foucaux, i. 26): "*De plus, amis, le Bôdhisattva n'entre pas dans le sein d'une mère pendant une quinzaine noire, mais le Bôdhisattva qui en est à sa dernière existence, pendant la quinzaine claire, et le quinzième jour, celui de la pleine lune, au temps de conjonction de l'astérisme Pouchya, entre dans le sein d'une mère livrée à la pénitence,*" has no connexion with the narrative of the star of the Wise Men. Similarly, it is a serious misunderstanding when Cheyne[5] describes as "genuinely Iranian" the tradition contained in the *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum* and elsewhere,

[1] *Theologie*, i. 413. The other Pauline passages cited by him and by Soltau, *Geburtsgeschichte*, 21 f., are, of course, not relevant to this discussion. Cp. also Soltau, "Die religionsgeschichtl. Forschung u. das Weihnachtsevangelium," *Sonntagsbeil. zur Voss. Zeitung*, 1904, 418. Unfortunately I have not yet seen the article by Oussani, "The Virgin Birth of Christ—Theory of Heathen Mythological Elements," *New York Review*, 1908, 471 ff.

[2] Cp. the exhaustive discussion in Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 222 ff. [Eng. trans. i. 231 ff.].

[3] Cp. *ibid.* 245 f. [Eng. trans. i. 239 f.]. Dieterich ("Die Weisen aus dem Morgenlande," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1902, 7 f.) is not justified in "altogether neglecting" this expectation.

[4] *Evangelium*, 135, 298. Still less have the passages quoted by Franke, *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2765.

[5] *Bible Problems*, 202 f., 248. Weinel, *Die Stellung des Urchristentums zum Staat*, 1908, 20, says: "Behind all this, and not yet fully comprehensible by us, there is some ancient Oriental religion which taught a belief in the Deliverer-God (Saviour), and promised his appearance, his 'coming,' which prophesied his ascent and his star in the luminous heights of heaven," etc. But, unfortunately, he does not indicate precisely what religion he means.

to the effect that Zarathustra predicted the appearance of this star. Kuhn[1] also thinks that only certain forms of that idea could be so described: but the expectation with which we are here concerned comes from Mt 2. This is, I believe, the way in which even Böklen[2] (to whom Cheyne appeals), and after him Jeremias,[3] have understood the matter: and prior to these, Cumont[4] says quite correctly: "Le récit des évangiles d'après lequel les mages d'Orient guidés par une étoile, s'étaient rendus à Bethléem pour y adorer l'enfant Jésus . . . fut habilement utilisé par ceux qui prétendaient mettre d'accord Zoroastre et le Christ. On alla jusqu'à soutenir en Orient que Zoroastre avait anciennement prédit la venue du Messie et le prodige qui l'annoncerait."

The circumstance that the Magi have commonly been regarded as Persians, in fact as worshippers of Mithras, has given occasion for another hypothesis. Dio Cassius (*Rom. Hist.* lxiii. 1 ff.), Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xxx. 16), and Suetonius (*Vita Ner.* 13, 30) speak of a journey to Rome which the Magus Tiridates and others—so, at any rate, Pliny reports—undertook in the year 66, in order to worship Nero as a god like Mithras. We are told also that the party finally returned by another route. Dieterich,[5] with the approval of L. Köhler,[6] Soltau,[7] Usener,[8] O. Pfleiderer,[9] Schmiedel,[10] Weinel,[11] Deissmann,[12] would use this episode to explain the journey of the Wise Men to Jerusalem. But, on the other hand, Gruppe,[13]

[1] In Böklen's *Verwandtschaft*, 99 f.
[2] *Ibid.* 97 ff.
[3] *Babylonisches*, 53.
[4] *Textes*, i. 42.
[5] *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1902, 1 ff.
[6] *Schweiz. theol. Zeitschr.*, 1902, 224.
[7] *Geburtsgeschichte*, 19 ff.; *Sonntagsbeil. zur Voss. Zeitung*, 1904, 418; *Fortleben*, 78. For the late origin of our narrative there should be no more appeals to the well-known statement which comes from a Syrian work passing under the name of Eusebius, since Usener (*Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1903, 20, n. 1) has correctly explained that statement.
[8] *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1903, 19 f.
[9] *Christusbild*, 101, n. 1 [Eng. trans. 149 n.]. The matter is differently stated in *Urchristentum*, i. 553 [Eng. trans. ii. 306 f.].
[10] "Neueste astronomische Feststellungen über den Stern der Weisen u. den Todestag Jesu," *Prot. Monatshefte*, 1904, 323 f.
[11] *Stellung*, 24.
[12] *Licht vom Osten*, 257, n. 1 [Eng. trans. 358, n. 3].
[13] *Mythologie*, 1620.

Cheyne,[1] Jeremias,[2] Fiebig,[3] Nestle[4] have very justifiably raised difficulties: for it would be contrary to all analogy if a historical event of this sort were the origin of a Gospel narrative. There is no need, however, of such an explanation: if once it was supposed that a star had appeared at the birth of Jesus, then it was natural enough to represent Magi as following it or as being guided by it, for such an idea was prevalent not only among the Greeks but among Jews as well.[5] There are other evidences, too, of the expectation that the Messiah would be recognized by the Gentiles; and the best known of such passages, Is 60[6], contains the expression "*They shall bring gold and frankincense.*" To explain this feature, therefore, there is no need to suppose, with Jeremias and Fiebig, that the Magi had seen, or were supposed to have seen, in the Messiah the sun-god, to whom, according to the lists compiled by Kircher (see p. 101), offerings of gold, ambergris, frankincense, honey, and myrrh are due:[6] still less need one say that, because the star must have denoted the sun-god, who appears at the vernal point of the ecliptic, it was really or nominally a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn (therefore no star) in Aries—a thing which it was *not*, even according to Kepler's view.[7]

Further, in one detail of our account, which is, of course, supplied by some of the authorities only, the influence of Mithraism has been detected. Preuschen[8] supposed that the reading of the earliest Armenian manuscript of the Gospels at Mt 2[9] ("*the star stood over the cave where the child was*") was the original one, but that because of its resemblance to a feature in the legend of Mithras, in which the god is even born of the rock, the reading was subsequently abandoned:

[1] *Bible Problems*, 246 f. [2] *Babylonisches*, 55. [3] *Babel*, 16 f.

[4] "Zu Mt. 2," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1907, 73.—J. Weiss, who would reconcile the different views, says (*Die Schriften*, i. 1. 220): "We do not venture to maintain that the story of Matthew's Gospel was produced by this historical incident. Only it may be said to be probable that through some such event the germ of a legendary representation already long existent was brought to full development."

[5] Cp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 248 [Eng. trans. i. 240 ff.].

[6] The parallel cited by Seydel, *Evangelium*, 139, is no parallel at all.

[7] Cp. Schmiedel, *Prot. Monatshefte*, 1904, 315, n. 1.

[8] "Jesu Geburt in einer Höhle," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1902, 359 f.

and Jeremias[1] and Brückner[2] asserted outright that the statement originated in that legend. However, the reading in the Armenian manuscript is probably not the original one, nor is it explained, as Förster[3] would suggest, by the Armenian practice of using caves for stables, but, as Usener[4] proves, by a tradition that can be shown to have existed elsewhere, and that has probably a similar basis.

Still, Dieterich[5] is justified in saying that the story of the Massacre of the Innocents is not explained by the story of the Magi. Neither is it immediately explained by the legends of the persecutions to which Cyrus, Romulus, and Augustus were exposed—legends to which Strauss,[6] Renan,[7] Usener,[8] O. Pfleiderer,[9] and Soltau[10] had previously directed

[1] *Babylonisches*, 56.

[2] *Gottheiland*, 30.

[3] "Nochmals Jesu Geburt in einer Höhle," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1903, 186 f.

[4] *Ibid.* 7.

[5] *Ibid.*, 1902, 1.

[6] *Leben Jesu*, i. 249 [Eng. trans. i. 242 f.].

[7] *Les évangiles*, 1877, 191.

[8] *Untersuchungen*, i. 77 f. Further, in reference to the well-known statement of Suetonius (*Vita Aug.* 94): "Auctor est Julius Marathus, ante paucos quam nasceretur menses prodigium Romae factum publice, quo denuntiabatur regem populi Romani naturam parturire. Senatum exterritum censuisse, ne quis illo anno genitus educaretur. Eos qui gravidas uxores haberent, quod ad se quisque spem traheret, curasse ne senatus consultum ad aerarium deferretur," Usener remarks, "Was Marathus a Syrian? His name might point to such an origin, but an argument of this sort is, I think, inconclusive. However that may be, at all events he knew how to turn to account the Massacre of the Innocents, in an earlier form of the story: he has only trimmed it a little to suit Roman conditions." If this is so, here too we should have a legend that was not independent of Mt 2 (and Dieterich also, *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1902, 2, regards the matter in this light). Usener says, on the other hand (*ibid.*, 1903, 20): "By itself the Massacre of the Innocents and its motivation by the fear of a future ruler were elements already present in the storehouse of legends, as we know . . . from the romantic narrative of Marathus in reference to the birth of Augustus"; and Dieterich, *ibid.*, 1902, 3, after quoting also the passage from Suetonius (*Vita Ner.* 36): "Stella crinita, quae summis potestatibus exitium portendere vulgo putatur, per continuas noctes orii coeperat. Anxius ea re, ut ex Balbillo astrologo didicit, solere reges talia ostenta caede aliqua illustri expiare atque a semet in capita procerum depellere: nobilissimo cuique exitium destinavit . . . damnatorum liberi urbe pulsi enectique veneno aut fame"—proceeds thus: "We shall not here pursue the question, how far perhaps the characteristics and the actions of Nero could affect men's idea of Herod, and the narratives regarding him; nor shall we study the origin of the legend of Herod's massacre in the light of more distant parallels to its motif."

[9] *Urchristentum*, i. 555 [Eng. trans. ii. 308].

[10] *Sonntagsbeil. zur Voss. Zeitung*, 1904, 418.

attention. The traditions which A. V. W. Jackson[1] cites regarding the youth of Zarathustra are too late to require our consideration; and the tradition regarding the childhood of Buddha, which Seydel[2] compares, is, as this scholar himself says, no proper parallel. We are told in the Abhinishkramana-Sûtra[3] that King Bimbisâra, on hearing of the birth of Buddha and on being urged to slay him, replied, "*If the child is to become a ruler, we shall obtain peace and joy under his rule; if he is to become a Buddha, we ought to become his disciples.*" There is, we must admit, greater similarity in the narrative of the persecution of Krishna in the Purânas, a parallel cited by O. Pfleiderer[4] as well as Seydel; but in this particular form one should probably explain it with Nève,[5] Hopkins,[6] and Keane[7] as due to Christian influences. Of course, only in this particular form: for in general it comes, like those already referred to, from the ancient sun-myth, "in which," says Tiele,[8] "the sun, born as the son of God, threatened by the powers of darkness, growing up as the shepherd of the heavenly kine (the sun's rays and the clouds) soon reveals himself as the triumphant hero, the deliverer of the world." To that myth we may trace another description, which J. Weiss[9] mentions, namely, the account given in the *Jalkut Rubeni* (f. 32. 3) and in Josephus (*Ant.* ii. 9. 2) of the snares that beset Abraham and Moses: but the question always arises, Why should these and similar incidents (a collection of which is furnished by Jeremias[10]) have been trans-

[1] *Zoroaster*, 1899, 28.

[2] *Evangelium*, 142 f., 298; cp. also von Hase, *Neutestamentl. Parallelen*, 15.

[3] Cp. Beal, *The Romantic Legend of Sâkya Buddha*, 1875, 103 f.

[4] *Urchristentum*, i. 555 [Eng. trans. ii. 308]; *Christusbild*, 40, 105 [Eng. trans. 61, 155].

[5] "Des éléments étrangers du mythe et du culte indien de Krishna," *Annales de philosophie chrétienne*, 1876, 410.

[6] *India*, 163.

[7] "Christ and Krishna," *Hibb. Journ.*, 1904–5, iii. 818.

[8] "Christus en Krishna," *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1877, 81; more generally Franke says (*Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2764): "The persecution of the divine child . . . is an offshoot of the ancient Aryan myth of the enmity shown by a despotic and (in some measure) discredited divinity . . . towards a young aspirant."

[9] *Die Schriften*, i. 1. 221.

[10] *Das A.T.* 410 ff. [Eng. trans. ii. 94 ff.].

ferred to Jesus? Accordingly we must look for still another origin of this tradition, and we find it with the help of Rev 12.

On earlier pages (101, 128 ff., 132 ff., 146) there have been frequent references to this remarkable chapter: but it is only at this point that a full exposition of it can be given. The writer of the Apocalypse must have intended it as an announcement of a persecution of the Christian church (the woman) by the devil (the dragon); but why does he depict the woman as arrayed with the sun, and standing on the moon, and wearing a crown of twelve stars upon her head? why does he speak of her as giving birth to the Messiah? for it is the Messiah who is represented as the man child who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron, and who is caught up unto God's throne so as to escape the plots of the dragon. The last circumstance shows clearly, as Vischer[1] first observed and as Gunkel[2] has most exhaustively proved, that the basis of the account is a Jewish tradition, for which the birth of the Messiah was still a future event: and so, quite independently of other objections, one must not suppose, with Bousset,[3] that some *Christian* "had transferred to Jesus, his Lord, a pagan myth regarding the birth, persecution, and victory of the youthful sun-god." But such a myth has left traces of its influence in the Jewish tradition just mentioned: for, as Gunkel[4] in particular has shown, the description of the woman, and the whole figure of the dragon, can be explained in no other way. Can the existence of such a myth be actually proved?

Dupuis,[5] Richter,[6] and — independently of them — Dieterich[7] and Maass,[8] refer to the narrative of Leto's giving birth to Apollo, which is, in fact, very similar: for

[1] "Die Offenbarung Johannis," *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, ii., 1886, 19 ff.

[2] *Schöpfung*, 173 ff. But it must not be supposed that I regard all his arguments as conclusive: *e.g.* it seems to me doubtful if the chapter is continued in $19^{11ff.}$.

[3] *Offenbarung*, 357.

[4] *Schöpfung*, 272 ff.; *Verständnis*, 55 ff.

[5] *Origine*, iii. 49.

[6] *Christentum*, 212.

[7] *Abraxas*, 1891, 117 ff.; *Nekyia*, 217, n. 3.

[8] *Orpheus*, 1895, 251 f.; cp. also Wundt, *Völkerpsychologie*, ii. 3. 465, n. 2.

she too is persecuted by a dragon. Like Bousset,[1] I should not suppose it to be so inconceivable as Gunkel[2] thinks, that this myth may have been drawn upon by a Jew: but it is I admit, more natural to think of another form of the myth, than the Greek one.

Accordingly, since the dragon, as we have seen, is of Babylonian origin, Gunkel[3] has identified the child with Marduk, and the woman with his mother Damkina, who is, in fact, described[4] in terms similar to those of Rev 12[1]. But if we neglect these similarities, the material here employed has not yet, at any rate, been shown to have existed in Babylonia[5]—and this remark applies also to the periods of time mentioned in vv.[6. 14], as we have already seen (p. 142). Further, it is altogether doubtful whether the eagle whose two wings are given to the woman (v.[14]), is the sign of that name, and therefore comes from Babylonia (or even from the myth of Etana).[6] This objection holds also against Jeremias,[7] who, following Dupuis,[8] discovers the woman herself in the sky in the sign of Virgo, and even appeals, in support of his contention, to the representation (see p. 292, n. 9) on the side-door of Notre Dame in Paris, where (he says) Virgo is omitted among the signs of the Zodiac because she is identified with Mary! But, as Jensen[9] shows, the Babylonians, like Easterns generally, had certainly no such name for this sign![10]

Bousset[11] further compares the myth that describes the persecution of Hathor or Isis by Typhon, and the birth of Horus: for Hathor or Isis is often represented with the sun on her head, and Typhon often as a dragon. And especially with v.[14] he would compare the passage from a hymn to

[1] *Offenbarung*, 353 f. [2] *Schöpfung*, 283 f. [3] *Ibid.* 379 ff.

[4] Cp. *ibid.* 386, n. 1; *Verständnis*, 56, n. 1; Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 360, n. 3; Jeremias, *Babylonisches*, 35 f.

[5] So also Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 379. [6] Cp. *ibid.* 566.

[7] *Babylonisches*, 35, 47 ff. [8] *Origine*, iii. 247 ff.

[9] *Die Kosmologie der Babylonier*, 1890, 67.

[10] Very arbitrary also is the assertion, *Das A.T.* 408, n. 3 [Eng. trans. ii. 91, n. 3], that in Rev 11[19] we have the "ark of deliverance," which, according to Jeremias, belonged to the myth! Dupuis, *Origine*, iii. 248, is, I admit, still more fanciful.

[11] *Offenbarung*, 354 f.; cp., further, Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, 513.

Osiris, which says: "*She* [*Isis*] *maketh a breeze with her feathers, and with her pinions causeth a wind to blow . . . she nourisheth her child in seclusion, and no one knoweth where it abideth and whither it goeth.*" But even Bousset does not venture to say that it is this myth that has been employed in the Apocalypse: so it is probably safest to conclude with Feine:[1] "We have in Rev 12 a myth, a combat of gods, a story of gods, which is of non-Christian and non-Jewish origin, which perhaps comes from Babylon, but in a kindred form meets us also among other peoples, and which has given to the Apocalyptic writer his colouring for the representation of Christ as the Messiah-King."

But it has given this colouring first of all to a Jewish writer; and that is *perhaps* the reason why we find even in the Talmud (*Jerus. Berakhôth*, f. 5, c. 1) a trace, very indistinct it is true, of this myth, in the statement that the Messiah was born at Bethlehem on the day of the destruction of Jerusalem, but was soon carried off from his mother by a strong gale. Again, the expectation stated in the Apocalypse of Zephaniah,[2] that the shameless one (*i.e.* Antichrist) would persecute the virgin Tabitha, might be connected with this. But, above all, it is probably the tradition regarding the birth of the Messiah—that tradition whose existence may be inferred from Rev 12—which has originated the narrative of the persecution of Jesus by Herod, and of the flight. In view of what has been already said (pp. 129 f., 133 f.) we cannot any longer be astonished that the dragon should be replaced by a human being: and Herod was specially well qualified to be regarded as such an incarnation of the unfriendly power.

It is true that we have still no explanation of the statement that he slew all the male children in Bethlehem under two years of age—not even in the passage from Jeremiah (31^{15}) which is quoted in Mt 2^{18} as scriptural evidence and is yet so far from apposite: "*A voice is heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping, Rachel weeping for her children; she*

[1] "Über babylonische Einflüsse im N.T.," *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 1906, 706.

[2] Cp. Stern, "Die koptische Apokalypse des Sophonias," *Zeitschr. f. ägypt. Sprache u. Altertumskunde*, 1886, 125.

refuseth to be comforted for her children, because they are not." This feature is undoubtedly the result of an endeavour to represent the tyrant as a monster of wickedness.

Further, the statement that the infant Jesus is brought for refuge to Egypt, is probably not to be derived from the passage Hos 11[1]: "*When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt,*" which is quoted, again rather unnaturally, in Mt 2[15]; still less does it come from the account of Moses' flight *from* Egypt to Midian, Ex 2[15]; for though in Mt 2[20] the reason stated for the return of the infant Jesus is the same as that for the return of Moses in Ex 4[19], this fact does not decide the question now before us. Still less can one suppose, with Usener,[1] that Jesus' escape, for the sake of which the Magi had to return to their own country by another route, is modelled on the flight of the Olympian gods before Typhon: on the contrary, the idea certainly originated through a closer delineation of the flight into the wilderness, which was narrated in the myth appropriated by Jewish thought. But although this myth and the notion of the star are ultimately of pagan origin—and this does not imply that one need follow Gunkel's[2] or even Jeremias'[3] theory of an earlier connexion between the two—the story of the Wise Men is primarily to be derived from Jewish conceptions; and in view of the Jewish-Christian character of the First Gospel, this is what one would most readily expect.

At the close of this section there appears for the first time the designation of Jesus as *Ναζωραῖος*, which may therefore fitly be discussed here. W. B. Smith[4] traces it, and the appellation "Jesus" itself, to the name of a deity, whose cult must probably then have influenced Christianity in other ways also. From the Old Testament (he proceeds) it does not come, though this is stated in Mt 2[23]; nor can it be derived from Nazareth, since no town of that name seems to have existed in the days of Jesus, and at all events it played no part in

[1] *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1903, 21.

[2] *Genesis*, 356 f. [3] *Babylonisches*, 27 ff.

[4] "Meaning of the Epithet Nazorean," *Monist*, 1905, 25 ff.; *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, 142 ff., cp. 36 f.

His life. The word הַנּוֹצְרִים, applied to the Christians in the Talmud, means rather (Smith says) the keepers and watchers; the singular הַנּוֹצְרִי is either simply הַנּוֹצֵר or a "rabbinical disguise" of that term, or most probably an abbreviation of NṢRIH, keeper of Jahweh, or Jahweh the keeper; in the *nomen restaurationis* of Marcus (Iren. *Adv. Haer.* i. 21. 3), Jesus actually had this surname; and in the great Paris Magical Papyrus, l. 1548, a god was so described. Smith finally regards it as a confirmation of his theory that Epiphanius (*Haer.* 29. 6) states that the Nazaraeans had existed before Christ.

To begin with the last argument, no importance need be attached to this statement of Epiphanius, since no opponent of heresy previous to him knows anything of such a sect. As has been shown by Lipsius,[1] and after him by Meyboom,[2] Epiphanius describes the Nazaraeans (18. 1) in the same way as the Christian Nazoraeans in 29. 1 ff., and distinguishes the former from the latter only because they had been inexactly described to him as Jews—as they were also to Filastrius (*Haer.* 8) and Jerome (*Ep.* 112).

Further, Marcus was not only probably but certainly a heretic of the second century: for Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* i. 13. 2) speaks of him as a contemporary, and boasts (iv. Praef.) of having been the first to refute him. Accordingly, one cannot maintain that the invocation *Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρία*—there is nothing that gives any clue to a written work of Marcus —"goes back very obviously and probably to the remotest antiquity": and even if that can be more plausibly said of the exorcistic formula of the Paris Magical Papyrus: *ὁρκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ μαρπαρκουριθ· νασααρι· ναιεμαρεπαιπαρι* (although this Papyrus itself belongs only to the fourth century of our era), still it is quite impossible to prove that the *Ναζωραῖος* of the New Testament is connected with that formula.[3]

Our conclusion is that, like the parallel *Ναζαρηνός*,

[1] *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanios*, 1865, 130 ff.

[2] "Jezus de Nazoraeër," *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1905, 529 ff.

[3] If Jerome (*Ad Isai.* 64[4], *Opera*, ed. Vallarsi, iv. 761) were correct in describing Marcus as an Egyptian, the word *Ναζαρία* as used by him might come from Egypt: but, of course, that is by no means certain.

Ναζωραῖος is most probably derived from Nazareth: for the Gospels supply convincing proof that a place of this name existed in Jesus' lifetime. And if, finally, no prophetic saying like the one quoted in Mt 2^{23}, *Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται*, can be exhibited, the Evangelist has probably thought of the passage Is 11^1 וְיָצָא חֹטֶר מִגֵּזַע יִשַׁי וְנֵצֶר מִשָּׁרָשָׁיו יִפְרֶה, and at the same time of the other passages where the Messiah is described as צֶמַח, Is 4^2, Jer 23^5 33^{15}, Zec 3^8 6^{12}. There is thus no occasion for such a religious-historical theory as Smith propounds.[1]

In regard to the story of the Nativity in Lk $2^{1ff.}$, I do not share the belief expressed by many others that it is, in Schleiermacher's[2] phrase, an "air-bubble conglobated out of nothing." I question the view that it is merely because of Mic 5^1 that the scene is laid at Bethlehem: still more the statement that a census was connected with it only in order to bring the parents of Jesus from Nazareth to Bethlehem.[3] However, if the shepherds at any rate should be unhistorical, they are probably not to be explained, as Strauss[4] attempts in some measure to explain them, by the pagan idea that gods frequently appeared to shepherds—still less by the other type of tradition, which makes Cyrus and Romulus grow up among shepherds. Nor do they come from the cult of Mithras, as J. Réville[5] conjectures, although Cumont[6] has shown that the representation of shepherds on Mithraic monuments has influenced Christian art—in the same way, one may remark, as the Persian god striking water out of the rock served as the model for Moses performing the

[1] One must not, therefore, on the hypothesis of their identity with the Nazerini of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v. 81), think of the Nosairis, for whom see the full account in Dussaud, *Histoire et religion des Noṣairîs*, 1900. In regard to the whole question, cp. also Weinel, *Ist das "liberale" Christusbild widerlegt?* 1910, 96 ff., whose arguments answer Brückner, *Gottheiland*, 47.

[2] *Leben Jesu*, 1864, 33.

[3] For a criticism of the explanation of this feature given by Drews (*Die Christusmythe*, 1909, 41), who derives it from the cult of Adonis, cp. J. Weiss, *Jesus von Nazareth*, 29.

[4] *Leben Jesu*, i. 215 f. [Eng. trans. i. 214 f.].

[5] "De la valeur du Mithriacisme comme facteur religieux du monde antique," *Études de théol. et d'hist.*, 1901, 339 f. More cautiously, Petersen, *Geburt*, 21 f.

[6] *Textes*, i. 162 f., 166, 177, 220, 342 f.

similar miracle, or as the ascension of Mithras served as the model for that of Elijah. The notion of the adoration of the shepherds is not on that account necessarily so derived: indeed, Cumont[1] regards it as probable that the Persian legend is dependent upon the Christian one; and the same is perhaps true of the later Krishna-legend, which has here close affinities with the Christian story.[2] Accordingly, if one regards the shepherds in the account of the Nativity as mere inventions, one must explain them as Strauss[3] did in the first instance: they appear as the successors of the patriarchs of old. But whether they were so regarded among the Jews as well, is very doubtful: Wetstein[4] cites *Kiddushin* iv. 14, according to which Abba Gorion described the keeping of sheep as the occupation of robbers, and *Sanhedrin* iii., which disallowed the evidence of shepherds.[5] Thus even here the basis of the story may have been a recollection of some actual event, and it may not be altogether accidental that precisely at this point it is said (Lk 2^{19}): "*But Mary kept all these sayings, pondering them in her heart.*"

The appearance of the angels (v.$^{9ff.}$) is derived by Seydel,[6] though only in connexion with other features, from Buddhist influences (*Lal. Vist.* 5, trad. par Foucaux, i. 43 ff., 51 ff.). But the similarity between the two accounts is too small to be explained by kinship.[7]

Finally, the angel's message: "*Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all the people: for there is born to you this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord,*" and then the song of praise: "*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom*

[1] *Textes*, i. 341.

[2] Cp. p. 302 above.

[3] *Leben Jesu*, i. 215 [Eng. trans. i. 214].

[4] *Nov. Test.* i. 661.

[5] Cp. also the passage cited by König (*Talmud u. N.T.*, 1907, 28), *Aboda Zara*, 26: "*Deliver not from danger the worshippers of idols and the keepers of flocks.*"

[6] *Evangelium*, 137 f., 299; cp. also O. Pfleiderer, *Christusbild*, 27, 105 [Eng. trans. 40, 155].

[7] In regard to Edmunds' derivation of v.^{14} from Buddhism (*Can the Pâli Pitakas aid us in fixing the Text of the Gospels?* 1905, 8; *Buddhist Texts quoted as Scripture by the Gospel of John*, 1906, 16 ff.), cp. de la Vallée-Poussin, *Rev. bibl.*, 1906, 367 f.

he is well pleased" (v.[14]), are traced by Soltau[1] to similar declarations that are contained in inscriptions from Asia Minor regarding the government of Augustus, and to which Mommsen and von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf,[2] Harnack,[3] and O. Pfleiderer[4] had already called attention. Harnack, however, had suggested that we have here to do with a usage of speech which is to be found elsewhere, and which was adopted by the later writings of the New Testament; and Wendland[5] describes in detail its origin and its influence on Christianity. But though he has proved his case as against Wagner,[6] still there is nothing but the phraseology dependent upon foreign influences, and the question of mere phraseology does not interest us here. The ancient-Eastern myth of the Saviour-king, which according to Jeremias[7] has here also left its traces, cannot be definitely discovered.[8]

As regards the story of the presentation of Jesus in the temple, one might believe it necessary to look for a non-Jewish prototype for it, seeing that the ground alleged in Lk $2^{22ff.}$ for the journey to Jerusalem does not correspond with the facts. For although Ex $13^{2ff.}$ required that the first-born should belong to God, there was no need that it should itself be brought to the temple in order to be redeemed. Indeed, if in Lk 2^{22} the words *ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν* were thoroughly genuine, the ex-

[1] *Geburtsgeschichte*, 18 f.; *Sonntagsbeil. d. Voss. Zeitung*, 1904, 418.

[2] "Die Einführung des asianischen Kalenders," *Mitteilungen des kais. deutschen arch. Institutes, ath. Abt.*, 1899, 275 ff.

[3] "Als die Zeit erfüllet war," *Christl. Welt.*, 1899, 1201 ff. = *Reden u. Aufsätze*, 1904, i. 301 ff.; "Der Heiland," *Christl. Welt.*, 1900, 30 ff. = *Reden*, i. 307 ff.

[4] *Christusbild*, 99 ff. [Eng. trans. 147 ff.]; cp. also Petersen, *Geburt*, 23, 41 f.

[5] ΣΩΤΗΡ, *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1904, 335 ff.; Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 75: cp. also Thieme, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander u. das N.T.*, 1905, 37 f.; Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 266 f. [Eng. trans. 369].

[6] "Über *σώζειν* u. seine Derivate im N.T.," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1905, 205 ff.

[7] *Babylonisches*, 57 ff.

[8] In reference to Jesus' acknowledgment of His Messiahship within sight of the temple of Augustus at Caesarea Philippi, Schwöbel, "Im Dscholan u. an den Jordanquellen," *Palästinajahrbuch*, 1905, 95, asks: "Could there be also a pointed allusion here to the utterance [*sic*] of Augustus, implying that the human race belonged to him, and that he brought deliverance and peace to the afflicted world?"

pression would be strange, since according to Lv $12^{2ff.}$ only the woman was unclean. Seydel[1] accordingly regards this narrative as derived from the story of the child Buddha's visit to the temple, of which Buddha says smilingly to his aunt: "*Quel autre dieu se distingue par sa supériorité sur moi, auquel tu me conduis aujourd'hui, ô mère? Je suis le dieu au-dessus des dieux, supérieur à tous les dieux; pas un dieu n'est semblable à moi, comment y en aurait-il un supérieur? En me conformant à la coutume du monde, voilà, ô mère, comment j'irai. Après avoir vu mes transformations surnaturelles, la foule ravie m'entourera d'hommages et du plus grand respect; dieux et hommes s'accorderont à dire: Il est dieux par lui-même*" (*Lal. Vist.* 8, trad. par Foucaux, i. 107). Further, although here the father alone brings the child to the temple, Seydel says that two of the Indian parallels—he means *Abhinish-kramaṇa-Sûtra* (8)[2] and *Buddha-ḳarita-Kávya*, i. 90, *Sacred Books*, xlix. 15 (cp. also the Chinese translation, the *Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king*, i. 1. 121, *Sacred Books*, xix. 19 f.)—mention the mother in addition to the father; and that with reference to them, one of these narratives (viz. the first) describes the purpose of the visit to the temple in these words: "*to pay the customary honours.*" I do not know whether Seydel meant that this corresponded with Lk 2^{24} "*to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord*"; at all events the mention of father and mother does not explain the expression quoted from v.[22]; it seems to me, however, that no such derivation is required, since the expression probably does not belong to the original text. And so, too, Buddha's visit to the temple has quite a different setting from that of Jesus: the belief that such a visit took place is much more readily derived from the story of Samuel (1 S $1^{24ff.}$), which was probably regarded as typical by the Christian communities among which this narrative had its rise. Or did they think of some usage like that which Curtiss[3] found in modern times among the Mawali Arabs?

[1] *Evangelium*, 146 f., 296; *Buddha-Legende*, 22 ff. Franke is more reserved, *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2766. In regard to O. Pfleiderer, cp. p. 295, n. 2 above.

[2] Cp. Beal, *Legend*, 52.

[3] *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, 201 f. [Germ. trans. 232].

That the narrative is unhistorical, may be inferred from what is told regarding Simeon and Anna; and at least the former of these is traced not only by Seydel [1] and van den Bergh van Eysinga,[2] but also by O. Pfleiderer [3] and Pischel,[4] to the legend of Buddha. Some draw a similar conclusion particularly from the statement in Lk 2^{27}, that Simeon came into the temple *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*, which, they believe, cannot refer to the Holy Spirit: but Oldenberg [5] shows that this is the only natural interpretation. The narrative regarding Asita, who comes through the air to Buddha (*Lal. Vist.* 7, trad. par Foucaux, i. 91 ff.; *Buddhakar.-Kâv.* i. 54 ff., *Sacred Books*, xlix. 10 ff.; *Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king*, i. 1. 70 ff., *Sacred Books*, xix. 12 ff.), is very different: he bows before Buddha to the earth, and then suddenly begins to weep, because he will no more experience the glory of his Buddhahood. The story in the Gospel is therefore not to be derived from this; indeed, no such original was required for it. For, as von Hase [6] says, "what is more natural than that the meeting between the old and the new should be exhibited in the persons of an aged man and the newborn child?" Again, the prophetess Anna is not necessarily to be traced to the old women who in the *Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king* (i. 1. 39, *Sacred Books*, xix. 7) wish Buddha good fortune; still less need the statement in Lk $2^{40.52}$ go back to the remark in the same work (i. 2. 147, *ibid.* 23): "*So as the light of the sun or the moon little by little increases, the royal child also increased each day in every mental excellency and beauty of person.*"

Finally, the story of the boy Jesus in the temple may very well be essentially historical, even if unhistorical details have been subsequently filled in. But if it is not historical, the Old Testament and Jewish prototypes (Moses and Samuel)

[1] *Evangelium*, 139 f., 298; *Buddha-Legende*, 18.

[2] *Einflüsse*, 28 ff.; "Altchristliches u. Orientalisches," *Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenl. Ges.*, 1906, 210.

[3] *Christusbild*, 27 ff., 105 [Eng. trans. 41 ff., 155].

[4] *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1904, 2939; "Der Ursprung des christl. Fischsymbols," *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1905, 532, n. 4; *Leben u. Lehre des Buddha*, 1906, 18 f.

[5] *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1905, 67 f.; "Altindisches u. Christliches," *Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenl. Ges.*, 1905, 625 f.

[6] *Parallelen*, 15.

—in whom Strauss[1] found the originals of the narrative, and whom Jeremias[2] without sufficient reason would trace to the ancient hope of a coming Saviour—would undoubtedly be a more obvious source than the non-Jewish parallels collected by Seydel.[3] The Buddhist legends that Seydel, O. Pfleiderer,[4] van den Bergh van Eysinga,[5] and Franke[6] refer to, are the least apposite of all. Of the narrative of Buddha's visit to the temple we have already spoken; but even the story of his appearance in the writing-hall, when he enumerates sixty-four alphabets, and asks the instructor, "Which of these am I to teach you?" (*Lal. Vist.* 10, trad. par Foucaux, i. 113 ff.) is altogether of a different nature. It is equally inconclusive to compare the other story, which tells how Buddha, on the occasion of some festivity, was separated from his company, and then was found sunk in contemplation (*Lal. Vist.* 11, trad. par Foucaux, i. 118 ff.); it must, however, be admitted that in the Abhinish-kramana-Sûtra the age of Buddha also is reckoned at twelve years; and it is said of the wise and saintly men who were then around him, that they were deeply versed in the scriptures of the Indian religion,[7] while in the *Gâtakas* the whole incident is connected with a religious festival.[8] If we refuse to regard these parallels as accidental, we must rather suppose that they are cases where Buddhism has borrowed from Christianity; in the *Lalita Vistara* (11, trad. par Foucaux, i. 123), however, the narrative closes with the words: "*Se conformant aux usages du monde, il demeura dans cette ville, ayant l'esprit occupé de son départ de la maison, lui, l'être parfaitement pur*"; whereas the Gospel of Luke (2^{51}) says of Jesus simply, "*He was subject unto them.*" And when the passage continues: "*And his mother kept all these sayings in her heart,*" this remark perhaps shows here again that in the

[1] *Leben Jesu*, i. 289 f. [Eng. trans. i. 280 f.].
[2] *Babylonisches*, 109 f.
[3] *Evangelium*, 148 f.; *Buddha-Legende*, 24 ff.
[4] *Urchristentum*, i. 413 f. [Eng. trans. ii. 111]; *Christusbild*, 29 f., 105 [Eng. trans. 43 ff., 155].
[5] *Einflüsse*, 33 f.
[6] *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2762.
[7] Cp. Beal, *Legend*, 72 ff.
[8] Cp. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Birth Stories or Jataka Tales*, i., 1880, 74 f.

preceding verses we have, generally speaking, to do with a historical tradition, and that therefore we have no need to search for a non-Jewish provenance for them.

b. The Baptism and Temptation.

The tradition in regard to the ministry of the Baptist, the historicity of which is also attested by Josephus, has hardly been explained by any one as due to other religions. Usener,[1] however, associates two circumstances—on the one hand, the form which the saying regarding "the mightier" takes in Mt 3^{11} and Lk 3^{16}: "*He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire*," and, on the other hand, the notice that is to be found in two Latin translations of Matthew's Gospel (at 3^{16}) and in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, that at the baptism of Jesus a bright light shone from Him or appeared at the place of His baptism; and he would trace this notice (and indirectly also that form of the saying regarding "the mightier") to the Stoic doctrine of the fiery spirit which permeates the universe. But the fire spoken of in Mt 3^{11}, Lk 3^{16} is not the fire of the Spirit, but the fire of judgment, and has thus far been already dealt with (p. 162 ff.); further, the notice found at Mt 3^{16} (and this notice does not belong to the original narrative) has nothing to do with the fiery spirit of the Stoics, or, as Zimmern[2] supposes, with the fire-god of the Babylonians, or, finally, as Gruppe[3] would have it, with Ishtar, but is to be explained by the ancient-Israelitish conception of the manifestation of the Godhead in fire, an idea which has also been already discussed (p. 138).

Certain scholars, however, *e.g.* Usener,[4] Wernle,[5] Soltau,[6] Gruppe,[7] have rejected the whole tradition as unhistorical, that is to say, the account of the baptism, or, at any rate, of an inward experience of Jesus on that occasion. It may be remarked that this inward experience is spoken of only by the earliest Evangelist, and that it alone is in keeping with

[1] *Untersuchungen*, i. 60 ff.
[2] *Keilinschriften*, 418 f.
[3] *Mythologie*, 1614.
[4] *Untersuchungen*, i. 98 ff.
[5] *Anfänge*, 32 [Eng. trans. i. 46].
[6] *Fortleben*, 76.
[7] *Mythologie*, 1617 f.

the subsequent Gospel narrative. The grounds for the rejection are either that the earliest Gnostics know nothing of it, or that Jesus must Himself have narrated His experience, which they say was not His usual manner. However, the silence of the Gnostics is not astonishing, in view of their Christology; and as regards the second point, we shall see immediately that the story of the temptation also goes back to a narrative told by Jesus Himself. Still it is not yet necessarily proved that the story of the baptism *must* have the same origin: the possibility remains that such an experience was only presupposed, or that it was derived from tradition, and then connected with the ministry of the Baptist.

This, however, we should have no need to suppose unless the story of the baptism raised difficulties: and, no doubt, Matthew, and after him (not before him, as Usener[1] and others maintain) the writer of the Gospel according to the Hebrews found difficulties in it. But these difficulties can be removed, and that without departing from the presupposition of the sinlessness of Jesus: we have therefore no occasion to regard the story of the baptism as of later origin. For even the Buddhistic parallels adduced by Seydel[2] and van den Bergh van Eysinga[3] are not of such a nature as to make it probable that this story is derived from them. In the narrative of Buddha's visit to the temple (*Lal. Vist.* 8, trad. par Foucaux, i. 107), to which we have twice referred, we find, indeed, a parallel to Mt 3^{15} "*For thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness*"; but otherwise the passage proceeds on totally different lines. And there is still less justification for comparing what is said in the *Rgya tcher rol pa*, 18 (trad. par Foucaux, ii. 259 f.), of Buddha's bath in the river Nairanjana: "*Des milliers de fils de dieux, dans le but d'accomplir l'oeuvre du sacrifice au Bôdhisattva, répandaient dans les eaux de la poudre divine d'aloès et de sandal, des essences des fleurs divines de toutes couleurs, de sorte qu'en ce moment la grande rivière Nairañjañâ coulait toute pleine de parfums divins et de fleurs*"; or what is said thereafter of his sudden realization of himself as the Buddha, that it was

[1] *Untersuchungen*, i. 58 ff.
[2] *Evangelium*, 155 f., 165 f., 299.
[3] *Einflüsse*, 36 f.

attended by similar phenomena. Jesus may actually have allowed Himself to be baptized in the name of the coming Messiah, and may, precisely on this occasion, have become conscious that He Himself was the Messiah: for from the psychological standpoint this also is quite comprehensible.

The comparison of the Spirit with a dove is certainly, in Mark and Matthew as well as in John, more than a mere figurative expression for His descent from heaven: Luke says plainly (3^{22}): "*The Holy Ghost descended in a bodily form as a dove upon him.*" But it does not follow that we must, with Usener,[1] Zimmern,[2] Gunkel,[3] Cheyne,[4] think of the sacred bird of Ishtar, of which there is nothing else here to remind us. That the Spirit was originally understood as the mother of Jesus—and *she* could more readily be connected in some way with Ishtar—cannot be proved for our canonical Gospels. Accordingly, one must probably find the explanation in the use which the Rabbis[5] made of the dove as a symbol of the Spirit: but even if this symbol should have been chosen at some earlier time under the guidance of Gentile models, it would be only a figurative expression, which has had no further influence on the conception itself.

That Jesus really became conscious of His Messianic calling at the time of His baptism, may be definitely inferred from the story of His temptation as it is told in Matthew and Luke—of course, only on the assumption that this is itself historical. Obviously it is not historical in the form in which it is narrated (and that form belongs to the Discourse-document); but it is equally impossible to believe that the narrative arose only at a later time, and was occasioned by the temptations encountered by the Church or by Jesus Himself. Jesus Himself must have described in this form the inward conflicts that He had to endure—conflicts that were, in fact, bound to be fought out before His public ministry began. To employ His power for His own purposes, to win His compatriots to His side by a daring exploit, to establish

[1] *Untersuchungen*, i. 56 f. [2] *Keilinschriften*, 440.
[3] *Verständnis*, 70. [4] *Bible Problems*, 84 f.
[5] Cp. Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* i. 268; Nestle, "Zur Taube als Symbol des Geistes," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1906, 358 f.

first of all an earthly kingdom—and that is the meaning of the three temptations—were ideas that may very well have occurred to Jesus, when once He became conscious of His Messianic vocation. So one cannot say, even of the third temptation, as van den Bergh van Eysinga [1] does, that it was inappropriate to Jesus: for the Messiah *was* expected to found an earthly kingdom—according to Israelitish notions, though not according to Jesus' own idea of His mission. And there is still less force in the objection that Jesus in leaping from the temple could not really dash His foot against a stone: the only point that raises doubts is whether Jesus told of His having fasted for forty days: for that would have been quite unlike His practice. This feature may therefore have been added subsequently, or may, at any rate, have been put in this form in order to explain Jesus' hunger: but the Old Testament instances of fasting in Ex 34^{28}, Dt $9^{9.\ 18}$, 1 K 19^{8}, were an adequate prototype, and there is no need to appeal to the narrative of Buddha's fasting (*Lal. Vist.* 17, trad. par Foucaux, i. 210 ff.). And still less does the description of the temptation itself require to be derived from Buddhism, as Seydel,[2] O. Pfleiderer,[3] and van den Bergh van Eysinga [4] attempt to derive it. The last-named scholar himself says that the agreement is almost confined to the setting of the two narratives: but even there it is too slight. For the statement in Mk 1^{13} that Jesus was with the wild beasts, is hardly to be understood as though they paid Him homage in the way described, at a similar point of the narrative, in the *Lalita Vistara* (19, trad. par Foucaux, i. 236),[5] or in the

[1] *Einflüsse*, 44 f. ; on the other hand also Pischel, *Leben des Buddha*, 26 f.

[2] *Evangelium*, 156 ff. ; *Buddha-Legende*, 12 ff., 28 ff.

[3] *Urchristentum*, i. 420 f. [Eng. trans. ii. 121 f.]; *Christusbild*, 33 ff., 105 [Eng. trans. 51 ff., 155].

[4] *Einflüsse*, 38 ff.

[5] More precisely the passage runs thus : "*Ainsi, religieux, le Bôdhisattva, au milieu des champs fortement ébranlés, lançant des rayons par centaines de millions au milieu d'une abondante pluie de fleurs, au milieu de milliers de vêtements flottants, de centaines de mille de tambours retentissant sous des coups répétés, au milieu des chevaux, des éléphants et des taureaux qui faisaient entendre leurs voix en tournant trois fois en présentant leur côté droit, au milieu des perroquets, des geais, des Kokilas, des Kalabingkas, des Djîvañjîvas, des cygnes, des oies, des cigognes et des paons par centaines de mille qui le saluaient, au milieu de bénédic-*

Abhinishkramaṇa-Sûtra.[1] Nor need one connect the remark made by Luke (4[13]), that the devil left Jesus ἄχρι καιροῦ, with the later enticements employed by Mâra. Even the temptation of Zarathustra (*Vd.* 19, *Sacred Books*, iv. 204 ff.), which is compared with the temptation of Jesus by the scholars named above, as well as by Gunkel [2] and J. Weiss,[3] is essentially different in its nature; and there is still less warrant for maintaining, with Gunkel, that the original material may have been a combat of gods for universal dominion. Such ideas can only occur to those who will not try first of all to find in the story its own explanation.

c. The Public Ministry.

According to Mk 1[15] and par., Jesus opens His ministry with the theme: "*The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the Gospel.*" Seydel [4] would derive this from Buddha's discourse as it appears in the *Mahâvagga* (i. 5. 12, *Sacred Books*, xiii. 88): "*Wide opened is the door of the Immortal to all who have ears to hear; let them send forth faith to meet it. The Dhamma sweet and good I spake not, Brahmâ, despairing of the weary task, to men.*" Similarly the account of Jesus' preaching on a mountain (Mt 5[1]) is traced by the same scholar to the simile in the *Mahâvagga* (i. 5. 7, *Sacred Books*, xiii. 86 f.): "*As a man standing on a rock, on mountain's top, might overlook the people all around, thus, O wise One, ascending to the highest palace of Truth, look down, all-seeing One, upon the people lost in suffering, overcome by birth and decay—thou, who hast freed thyself from suffering.*" Lastly, Seydel connects the Beatitudes of Jesus (Mt 5[3ff.]) with those of an earlier passage in the same Buddhist work (i. 3. 4, *Sacred Books*, xiii. 81): "*Happy is the solitude*

tions par centaines de mille, c'est avec l'arrangement de la route qui présentait un pareil spectacle que le Bôdhisattva se dirigea vers Bôdhimaṇḍa."

[1] Cp. Beal, *Legend*, 147, 153, 171, 222, 224.

[2] *Verständnis*, 70 f.

[3] *Die Schriften*, i. 1. 46. Still less relevant is the Persian legend which Willrich compares ("Zur Versuchung Jesu," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1903, 349 f.).

[4] *Evangelium*, 175, 179, 192 f., 299; *Buddha-Legende*, 32 f., 105 f., 120.

of him who is full of joy, who has learnt the Truth, who sees the Truth. Happy is freedom from malice in this world, self-restraint towards all beings that have life. Happy is freedom from lust in this world, getting beyond all desires; the putting away of that pride which comes from the thought 'I am.' This truly is the highest happiness." But here again we have connexions traced between things totally dissimilar: and there is still less relevance in comparing the "five-times seven conditions of welfare and six conditions more" which Buddha at the beginning of the *Mahâ-parinibbâna-Sutta*, 1. 6 ff. (*Sacred Books*, xi. 6 ff.), communicates to his disciples.

In Mt 5^{16} we meet for the first time the description of God as ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, which also occurs elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels, but particularly in the Gospel of Matthew. No doubt it is adequately explained by the Jewish transcendentalism of which we have already spoken; but it might also, like other designations that have been discussed in their own place (p. 80 ff.), have passed into general use in consequence of foreign influences.[1] Bousset,[2] in fact, thinks of such an influence as coming from Parsism: for it is in the edicts of Persian kings and in colloquies between Jews and Gentiles in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, that the name occurs with special frequency. But the usage spoken of can hardly be derived from that one source: indeed, it is more natural to suppose Semitic influences. For "we should be able to demonstrate that all the Semites at one time prayed to the Lord of Heaven as God Most High, even if we did not meet the name Ba'al-shamîn (Bêl-shamê) among almost every Semitic people."[3] Of course these deities, as Cumont[4] believes, owe their later character to the advance of Mazdeism and then to astrology: it would accordingly be Persian and Babylonian influences together that had aided (if any had) the establishment of this name for God in Judaism. And

[1] So also Gunkel, *Genesis*, 222.

[2] *Religion*, 359, n. 3.

[3] Tiele, *Geschichte der Religion im Altertum*, i., 1896, 240; cp. in detail Baudissin, art. "Baal u. Bel," *Prot. Realencykl.*[3] ii., 1897, 331; also Cumont, *Textes*, i. 86, n. 3, and Kessler, art. "Mandäer," *Prot. Realencykl.*[3] xii., 1903, 168.

[4] *Les religions orientales*, 154; cp. Wendland, in Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 163.

then one might regard this as a possible source also for the use of the term "heaven" as a name for God—for example, when the prodigal son in Lk $15^{18.\ 21}$ resolves to say and does say, *πάτερ, ἥμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου.*

The saying of Jesus in Mt 8^{20}, Lk 9^{58}: "*The foxes have holes and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head*"—is compared by Seydel [1] with the irate judgment which, according to the *Mahâvagga* (iii. 1. 2, *Sacred Books*, xiii. 298 f.), the people passed on the followers of Buddha because they continued their itinerancy even during the rainy season: "*Shall the birds make their nests on the summits of the trees, and retire during the rainy season, and arrange themselves places to live in: and yet the Sakyaputtiya Samaṇas go on their travels alike during winter, summer, and the rainy season, crushing the green herbs, hurting vegetable life, and destroying the life of many small things?*" But the resemblance is only very slight.

The saying of Mk $2^{19f.}$ and par.: "*Can the sons of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?*"—the parables of the Marriage Feast and the Wise Virgins, Mt $22^{1ff.}$ $25^{1ff.}$, Lk $14^{16ff.}$, the passages where Jesus is spoken of as a bridegroom, 2 Co 11^{2}, Jn 3^{29}, and the heavenly Jerusalem as His bride, Rev $19^{7ff.}$ 21^{9} 22^{17}, are derived by Zimmern [2] and Bousset,[3] in part also by Gunkel [4] and Jeremias,[5] from a myth regarding the marriage of the victorious god, whom the two first-named scholars define more precisely as Marduk. Zimmern and Bousset refer, besides, to the marriage of the Saviour with Wisdom in Gnostic teaching:[6] and behind the figure of Wisdom, as we shall presently see, there stands Ishtar. But it is only in the case of the Apocalypse, where the incident is really preceded by such a contest, that we have to think of such a myth: and to the Apocalypse Gunkel and Jeremias limit themselves. In the other passages we have to do only with comparisons which

[1] *Buddha-Legende*, 116.
[2] *Keilinschriften*, 394.
[3] *Offenbarung*, 427.
[4] *Verständnis*, 59.
[5] *Babylonisches*, 45.
[6] Cp. also Anz, "Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, xv. 4, 1897, 97; Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, 260 ff.

can be explained independently of such a prototype, and indeed have clearly a different basis.[1] Still less should any one, with Dieterich,[2] suppose a connexion between these parabolic expressions and the mystery-cults, in which there were rites that symbolized a physical union between the deity and the worshipper: for there is absolutely no reference to this in the passages cited.

The number of the twelve disciples, Mk 3^{14} and par., is traced by Seydel[3] to a passage in the *Mahâvagga* (x. 5. 6, *Sacred Books*, xvii. 317), in which there are, in fact, twelve disciples of Buddha enumerated: but this passage, in the first place, stands quite alone, and, in the second place, is perhaps not intended in this sense: for after the twelve there are other disciples named, though not in the same way. In the *Ḳullavagga* (i. 18. 1, *Sacred Books*, xvii. 359 f.) there are only eleven of them; but this is, I think, merely an inadvertence. At one point, again, there is an incidental reference to three disciples (*Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king*, iv. 17, *Sacred Books*, xix. 200 f.)—a circumstance that need excite no surprise in view of the remarks already made (p. 208) regarding the number three.

The expression *αἰώνιον ἁμάρτημα*, Mk 3^{29}, is unparalleled in the New Testament, and has therefore been altered by many copyists: but should one on that account trace it with Edmunds[4] to the Pâli-formula kappatthika kibbisa (*Ḳullavagga*, vii. 3. 16, *Sacred Books*, xx. 254)? De la Vallée-Poussin remarks,[5] on the other hand: "Croirons nous que, non pas une légende bouddhique, ce qui est possible à l'extrême rigueur, mais bien un détail isolé de la dogmatique, ait pénétré jusqu'à S. Marc? D'autant que, si l'idée d'une faute irréparable n'a rien de rare, il se fait que le texte pâli allégué écarte absolument l'idée d'un péché qui dure 'in aeternum,' que l'idée d'un châtiment éternel est étrangère à la dogmatique

[1] In the case of John, Philonic influences may have contributed; cp. Grill, *Untersuchungen*, i. 124.

[2] *Mithrasliturgie*, 129 f.; cp. 122 ff.; cp. also Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 227 ff.

[3] *Buddha-Legende*, 118 f.

[4] *Buddhist and Christian Gospels*, 29; *Buddhist Texts*, 18 f.

[5] *Rev. bibl.*, 1906, 369.

pâlie ou sanscrite, que *αἰώνιος* ne signifie pas 'qui dure une période cosmique,' et que tout le contexte évangélique sur la rémission des péchés est absolument opposé aux doctrines du Bouddhisme pâli."

Jesus' parabolic mode of expression, of which we first find instances in Mk 4 and par., is traced by Seydel,[1] with some hesitation, to Buddhist influences, while Havet[2] is of opinion that "l'enseignement bouddhique semble avoir créé cette parabole doctrinale." But it is found even in the Old Testament, although not so frequently. Franke[3] compares with the parable of the Sower the parable in the *Saṃyutta-Nikâya*, 42. 7: "*The husbandman tills not only the best sort of land, but also the medium sort and the inferior, salt, poor jungle-land, for he thinks that at any rate forage will grow there. The best sort of land is like my monks and nuns, . . . the medium sort like the lay associates, . . . the bad sort is like the adherents of other religious societies. Even to them I preach my doctrine . . ., for though they understand only a little of it, still it may conduce to their eternal welfare*"[4]—and pronounces this judgment upon it: "One must regretfully acknowledge that the fundamental idea brought out by the parable is incomparably higher in the Buddhist text than in the Christian Gospels." But this opinion may be assailed, and the dependence of the one parable upon the other cannot be proved.

In dealing with the narrative of the sending forth of the disciples, Mk $6^{6ff.}$ and par., Seydel[5] quotes the similar description in the *Mahâvagga* (i. 11. 1, *Sacred Books*, xiii. 112 f.). True, there is a discrepancy between Mk 6^{7} and par.: "*He began to send them forth by two and two*," and the *Mahâvagga*: "*Let not two of you go the same way*"; but Seydel consoles himself with the reflection that Beal remarks on the parallel passage in the Buddha-*k*arita: "Subsequently the disciples were not permitted to go alone, but only by two and two." Again, Rhys Davids and Oldenberg[6] remark on

[1] *Evangelium*, 223 ff., 301.
[2] *Le Christianisme et ses origines*, iv., 1884, 53 f.
[3] *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2759.
[4] Cp. also *Mahâvagga*, i. 5. 11, *Sacred Books*, xiii. 88.
[5] *Evangelium*, 259 ff., 299; *Buddha-Legende*, 107 f.
[6] *Sacred Books*, xiii. 112, n. 1.

the passage in the Mahâvagga: "This cannot be understood as a general rule, for it is repeated nowhere where precepts for wandering Bhikkhus are given; and, on the contrary, numerous instances occur in the Sacred Texts in which two or more Bhikkhus are mentioned as wandering together, without any expression of disapproval being added." In this matter, then, the Christian precept would, at any rate, agree with the Buddhist practice; but, of course, it does not follow that it is derived from it, any more than the other parts of this discourse of Jesus require to be connected with similar features in Buddhist works.

In Mt 11^{19}, Lk 7^{35} we read: *ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων* or *ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς*: at all events Wisdom appears as a divine hypostasis, just as in Lk 11^{49}, where she is represented as speaking, and as also in the Old Testament and Jewish literature.[1] This speculation may, like the similar one already discussed (p. 116 f.), be explained apart from any theory of foreign influences; but here also, and here especially, it is easier to assume that such influences have been at work, although independently of these there has been a natural development within Judaism. Since Ishtar is latterly identified with Wisdom,[2] one might think of that divinity, as do Zimmern[3] and Gunkel[4] (the latter of whom, however, as we shall immediately see, gives still other explanations): for in the form of Siduri-Sabītu she is, in fact, regarded as the goddess of Wisdom; she is regarded also as the potter or modeller who formed men of earth, was then made subordinate to God as the first of His creations, and put at His side as the overseer of His works.[5] This derivation is at all events more natural than the one attempted by Gunkel,[6] viz. from Kettu and Mêsharu (Right and Judgment), children of the Babylonian

[1] Cp. the short account in Bousset, *Religion*, 394 ff.

[2] Cp. Anz, *Texte u. Unters.* xv. 4. 90 ff.; Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, 26, 77 ff., 269 ff.

[3] *Keilinschriften*, 439 f.; cp. 429, 432.

[4] *Verständnis*, 26; cp. in general also his remarks in *Genesis*, 92, and in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen*, ii. 360, note g.

[5] But אָמוֹן in Pr 8^{30} is probably not to be translated in this way.

[6] *Verständnis*, 8, n. 3.

sun-god; or from the primal beings Sydyk and Misor (Honesty and Justice), who are mentioned in Philo Byblius, and who, according to Jeremias,[1] have left traces on other passages of the Old Testament; or, finally, from Isis, whom Reitzenstein[2] considers as the prototype, or, at any rate, a prototype, of the figure of Wisdom. But the closest parallel is to be found in Spenta Ârmaiti,[3] a Parsic figure that was much more likely to influence Jewish religion than the divinities named above. Cheyne,[4] Beer,[5] O. Pfleiderer,[6] and Bousset,[7] as against Gunkel (who, however, concedes to her *some* influence), are therefore entirely justified in deriving the "Wisdom" of Judaism from Spenta Ârmaiti—so far as "Wisdom" is not indigenous in Jewish thought.

In the narrative of the miraculous feeding of the multitude (Mk $6^{30ff.}$ $8^{1ff.}$ and par.), Gunkel[8] would again suspect the presence of a mythological element. He thinks more particularly of heathen representations of the miracle which the god of husbandry performs afresh every summer; but it cannot be proved, so far as I see, that this was ever similarly represented. Further, there would require to have been some occasion for transferring this myth to Jesus; but such embellishing of the historical incident on which the narrative is founded, is most simply explained by the Old Testament prototypes—in particular, the feeding of a hundred men by Elisha with twenty loaves and some ground corn (2 K $4^{42ff.}$) The parallel from the preface to one of the *Gâtakas*, which

[1] *Das A. T.* 143, n. 2 [Eng. trans. i. 157, n. 2].

[2] *Fragen*, 105 f., 108 ff.; *Poimandres*, 44 f., 249, n. 1.

[3] Cp. especially *Ys.* 47. 3 (*Sacred Books*, xxxi. 148 f.): "*And as to her, for her, as joyful meadows of her peace, wilt Thou bestow Thine Âramaiti, who is our Piety as earth considered, since he* [*or 'she,' as she once bewailed in a colloquy. Otherwise the person who was appointed to care for her interests is meant*] *for her has taken counsel with Thy Good Mind, Lord.*"

[4] *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, 1891, 322; *Semitic Studies in Memory of Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut*, 1897, 112; art. "Zoroastrianism," *Enc. Bibl.* iv., 1903, 5441.

[5] *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1899, 330.

[6] *Christusbild*, 16 [Eng. trans. 25].

[7] *Religion*, 592; in general, cp. Tiele, *Geschichte*, ii. 147 ff.; A. V. W. Jackson, in Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss*, ii. 638.

[8] *Verständnis*, 71.

M. Müller[1] and Franke[2] adduce, is so late that it hardly requires to be discussed.

The same remark applies to another attempted identification. The story of Peter's walking upon the sea, Mt 14[28ff.], is compared by M. Müller,[3] Seydel,[4] and van den Bergh van Eysinga[5] with the narrative which describes how a pious layman, filled with thoughts of the Buddha, walked upon the river Akiravatî; when he reached the middle, he beheld the waves; then his ecstasy left him and his feet began to sink (*Ǧâtakas*, No. 190, ed. Cowell, ii. 77). There is nothing in Matthew's account to point to a foreign provenance: Peter's walking upon the sea is certainly intended from the first to illustrate his faith, not the magical power of Jesus—to say nothing of the assertion that the varying construction of ἐπί in v.[25ff.] suggests diversity of authorship. Still, the two narratives are so similar to one another that one might, I believe, think of literary connexion between them. But then the Buddhist story would have to be derived from the Christian, especially as in the former the waves that the disciple sees are really an inappropriate feature.[6] The passages cited by Franke[7] from the *Mahâvagga*, i. 20. 16 (*Sacred Books*, xiii. 130 f.) and the *Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta*, 1. 33 f. (*ibid.* xi. 21 f.) are early enough: but, as van den Bergh van Eysinga[8] reasonably urges, the subject there is Buddha's walking *through* the water and flying over the Ganges; in other words, the stories are different. And, what is more important, neither the narrative of Jesus' walking on the sea nor the statements in regard to Peter that are added in Matthew's Gospel, require any derivation from such originals: those from the Old Testament are certainly not adequate, but one has all that one needs in a much more

[1] "Coincidences," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, 1897, xviii. 106 f.

[2] *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2760.

[3] *Transactions*, 1897, 105 f.

[4] *Buddha-Legende*, 110.

[5] *Einflüsse*, 52 ff.

[6] At any rate, Hopkins, *India*, 134, says: "It is quite impossible to say on historical evidences whether these stories were borrowed by or from Christianity. All we know is that they are Jataka stories, and there is no proof that these special Jatakas were pre-Christian; which, however, does not prove that they were not."

[7] *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2762.

[8] *Einflüsse*, 55, n. 2.

obvious source, viz. the Oriental-Greek representations to which Wetstein [1] and Strauss [2] called attention, and of which, I believe, Gunkel [3] and Heitmüller [4] also think.

Another narrative regarding Peter which is related only by Matthew (16^{19}) is concerned with Jesus' famous words to him: "*I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.*" Dupuis,[5] partly on the basis of this passage, asserted that Peter is a character modelled on Janus, who also carries keys; and W. Köhler [6] thinks that he is, at any rate, intended as a contrast to the pagan and Gnostic key-bearers at the entrance to the region of bliss: on that account there is assigned to him this power also, that in mysteries, and especially in baptism, he sets men free from the fetters of daemons, and binds them to the Christian faith.[7] We have already seen (p. 212 ff.) that such a conception of baptism cannot be shown to exist in primitive Christianity: but, more than this, H. Holtzmann [8] proves, in my judgment conclusively, that binding and loosing here mean "retaining" and forgiving sins. And finally, even the key of the kingdom of heaven may be derived from Jewish thought: for if one can come into this kingdom, it has gates like heaven itself; and for these gates there are, of course, one or several keys. That is also the explanation of the key which "he that is holy, he that is true," possesses (Rev 3^{7})—the details are, no doubt, drawn from Is 22^{22}; the keys of death and of Hades in Rev 1^{18} open the gates of this abode, and the gates of Hades are spoken of not only in Mt 16^{18} but also in the Old Testament. Thus there is no need, with Gunkel [9] and probably also with Bousset,[10] to derive even Rev 1^{18} from Mithraism,

[1] *Nov. Test.* i. 417 f.

[2] *Leben Jesu*, ii., 1836, 191 [Eng. trans. ii. 399].

[3] *Verständnis*, 71.

[4] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii., 1907, 3. 240.

[5] *Origine*, iii. 47.

[6] "Die Schlüssel des Petrus," *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1905, 214 ff.

[7] In reference to this belief and usage of speech, cp. now Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 220 ff. [Eng. trans. 306 ff.].

[8] *Handkommentar zum N.T.* i. (1889), ^{3}1901, 1. 259.

[9] *Verständnis*, 73.

[10] *Offenbarung*, 197, n. 6; cp. also Robertson, *Pagan Christs*, 206.

in which, besides, as W. Köhler[1] points out, only keys of heaven are spoken of. But if W. Köhler, in support of his own view, appeals to the later representation of Peter as Kronos or Janus, a piece of evidence to which Jeremias[2] also attaches some importance, this sheds as little light on the *origin* of the conception as the similar evidence in the other cases mentioned above (p. 308 f.). In view of the character of Matthew's Gospel as a whole, it is, besides, extremely improbable that an idea derived from such sources should have found expression in it.

With Jesus' announcement of His passion which follows on Peter's confession (Mk $8^{31ff.}$ and par.), Seydel[3] compares the corresponding utterances of Buddha in the *Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta*, 2. 29 ff., 5. 7 ff. (*Sacred Books*, xi. 35 ff., 87 ff.); and, in particular, he calls attention to the similarity between the reproof addressed to Peter in Mt 16^{23} and that addressed to Upâvana: but the latter is reproved, as Seydel himself says, because he conceals the dying Buddha from the spirits that call him to them; that is to say, for quite another reason than that in Matthew's narrative. If this be so, is any one justified in comparing Jesus' address to Peter as Satan with Buddha's statement to his disciple that only unwise spirits wished his life to be prolonged—or in comparing the reproof: "*Thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men*," with what follows in the story of Buddha: "*But the spirits who are free from passion bear it calm and self-possessed, mindful of the saying which begins: Impermanent indeed are all component things*"?

In the account of the Transfiguration (Mk $9^{2ff.}$ and par.), Gunkel[4] sees evidences of a mythological element. "Three transfigured, heavenly beings appear. Further, the words '*Let us here build tabernacles*,' which in their present context are devoid of meaning, must at one time have had a meaning of some sort." But this meaning may very well

[1] *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1905, 228.

[2] *Babylonisches*, 92: cp., further, Drews, *Die Christusmythe*, 168 ff., *Die Petruslegende*, 1910; Robertson, *Christianity and Mythology*, 378 ff. [Germ. trans., *Die Evangelien-Mythen*, 101 ff.].

[3] *Evangelium*, 254 f., 261 f., 299.

[4] *Verständnis*, 71.

be what J. Weiss[1] supposes, viz. "We have reached the goal, let us cleave to this felicity." And again, the transfiguration of Jesus and the appearance of Moses and Elias have been already (p. 140) explained without the aid of any reference to the brightness which, according to the *Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta*, 4. 47 ff. (*Sacred Books*, xi. 80 ff.), shone from Buddha's body, especially at his death. Rhys Davids,[2] Seydel,[3] and van den Bergh van Eysinga[4] no doubt think it remarkable that the transfiguration of Jesus is preceded by the announcement of His death (and His resurrection and second coming): but in this very circumstance one may find the explanation of the disciples' vision, in which they already beheld Jesus in the guise in which He was to come again. That this scene properly belongs to the post-resurrection period is an entirely arbitrary assertion of van den Bergh van Eysinga, who, however, very justly directs attention to the differences between the Gospel and the Buddhist narrative.

Jesus' conversation with the disciples as they came down from the mountain might remind one of the beginning of the later *Poimandres* (13. 1): *ἐμοῦ σου ἱκέτου γενομένου ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ ὄρους καταβάσεως μετὰ τὸ σὲ ἐμοὶ διαλεχθῆναι ποθουμένου τε τὸν τῆς παλιγγενεσίας λόγον μαθεῖν . . . ἔφης, ὅταν μέλλῃς κόσμου ἀπαλλοτριοῦσθαι παραδιδόναι μοι*—but this similarity also is, I think, only external and accidental. The subsequent Gospel narrative regarding the healing of the moon-struck boy (as the Greek term in Matthew describes him) contains the words (Mt 17^{15}): "*Oft-times he falleth into the fire, and oft-times into the water*"; and Zimmern[5] and J. Weiss,[6] who understand these expressions as referring to feverish heat and fits of shivering, point out that in Babylonian medicine these symptoms were attributed to the influence of the moon: but the words are certainly to be taken in their literal sense, and Matthew speaks of moon-struck (*i.e.* epileptic) persons elsewhere (4^{24}).

[1] *Die Schriften*, i. 1. 144.
[2] *Sacred Books*, xi. 82, n. 1.
[3] *Evangelium*, 247; *Buddha-Legende*, 121, 205.
[4] *Einflüsse*, 73 ff.
[5] *Keilinschriften*, 366; cp. 363 f.
[6] *Die Schriften*, i. 1. 147.

Seydel[1] compares with the narrative of Jesus' visit to Mary and Martha (Lk $10^{38ff.}$)—for that is the story that he means, although he heads his chapter with the reference Lk $7^{36ff.}$—the story of Buddha's visit to the courtesan Ambapâli in the *Mahâvagga* (6. 30. 1 ff., *Sacred Books*, xvii. 105 ff.) and the *Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta* (2. 16 ff., *Sacred Books*, xi. 30 ff.), where we are told that after the meal she sits on a low seat at the Master's side. But in dealing with this subject, Seydel not only, like the Gospel of John, confuses the Mary of Luke's Gospel with the woman who anoints Jesus at Bethany, but he further confuses this latter with the sinful woman of Lk $7^{36ff.}$, and her again (to judge by the heading of the chapter) with Mary Magdalene. All this is quite unwarranted: accordingly there is no parallel to discuss, and even Seydel does not attempt to explain the supposed parallel by literary connexion.

In reference to the laudation of Jesus by the woman out of the multitude: "*Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck*," and Jesus' answer: "*Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it*" (Lk $11^{27f.}$), Seydel[2] and van den Bergh van Eysinga[3] note the story in the Nidânakathâ[4] which tells how once a noble virgin, being charmed by the beauty and majesty of Buddha, greeted him from the upper storey of her palace with the words: "*Blessed indeed is the mother, blessed is the father, blessed is the wife, that own this Lord so glorious*"—and that he replied that the true blessing was only to be found in Nirvâna. Both scholars believe, further, that the passage in Luke is separable from its context; but the same may be said of many episodes that are not therefore unhistorical. One may say, on the contrary, that the woman's exclamation and Jesus' reply are so comprehensible in themselves that they do not in any way point to a foreign prototype. Indeed, if one would suppose such foreign influence, the

[1] *Evangelium*, 185 f.; *Buddha-Legende*, 118. Also Edmunds, *Gospels*, 5, cites "the Magdalene" as the 21st parallel.

[2] *Buddha-Legende*, 20 f., 93.

[3] *Einflüsse*, 48 ff.

[4] Cp. Rhys Davids, *Birth Stories*, i. 79 f.

parallels quoted, *e.g.* by Wetstein,[1] would be much more apposite than this one from Buddhist literature.

The saying of the rich fool, Lk 12^{19}: *ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου*, is compared by Seydel[2] with the formula which frequently occurs in Buddhist writings (*e.g.* in the *Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta*, 5. 44, *Sacred Books*, xi. 101), "*Eat, drink, and be merry*"; but a closer parallel, closer even than the Roman parentation-formula which Rönsch[3] adduces, may be found in Ec 8^{15} and To 7^{10}, where eating, drinking, and being merry are ranked together.

In regard to the parable of the Prodigal Son, Lk $15^{11ff.}$, O. Pfleiderer[4] and van den Bergh van Eysinga,[5] following earlier scholars, believe that it is perhaps derived from the same source as a parable in the *Lotus* (4, *Sacred Books*, xxi. 99 ff.), which even in Seydel's[6] opinion has nothing in common with the Christian parable except that a son who has left his home returns in destitution. But while in the one story the father at once receives his son again, in the other he does not make himself known to his son till after twenty years: indeed, the Buddhist parable is not necessarily so early as the other. Further, when van den Bergh van Eysinga compares in addition the legend of Aḥiḳar, which probably came from a Gentile source, it must be remarked that this contains parallels only to individual features of the parable: it cannot be thought, therefore, that the parable has been modelled upon that legend.

The story of the rich young man (Mk $10^{17ff.}$ and par.) is regarded by Seydel[7] as similar to a narrative in the *Mahâvagga* (i. 30 f., *Sacred Books*, xiii. 172 ff.), the substance of which he gives in this form: "A certain Brahman expected to have enjoyable meals among the Buddhists, and when disillusioned

[1] *Nov. Test.* i. 729 f. Bousset, *Theol. Rundschau*, 1899, 76, remarks further: "In the biography of Gabriele von Bülow it is told that in Spain on one occasion Frau von Humboldt was stopped in the middle of the street by a matron, who called her a blessed woman because of her handsome son. It is hardly probable that the Spanish dame, in so doing, thought of Lk 11^{27}."

[2] *Buddha-Legende*, 122.

[3] *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, 1874, 124, n. 16.

[4] *Urchristentum*, i. 447 f. [Eng. trans. ii. 160].

[5] *Einflüsse*, 67 ff.

[6] *Evangelium*, 230.

[7] *Buddha-Legende*, 113 f.

withdrew from them: accordingly it was prescribed that every one who sought admission should previously be warned that he would have to eat bread given in alms, be clothed in rags, lodge under the open sky, and suffer other hardships: but seeing that this proved to be too rapid a deterrent in the case of another candidate, the rule was thus far modified that the warning should be given immediately after ordination." Accordingly, there is not much left of the parallel to the Gospel narrative.

"The account of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem" (Mk 11[8ff.] and par.), says Franke,[1] "has certain correspondences with that of a solemn entry of Buddha Dîpaṅkara in chap. 2 of the *Buddhavaṃsa*: for there it is said, '*The people swept the pathway, the gods strewed flowers on the pathway, and branches* [*or blossoms?*] *of the coral-tree, the men bore branches of all manner of trees, and the Bodhisattva Sumedha spread his garments in the mire, men and gods shouted, All hail!*'" But so far as there is real correspondence between the two accounts, it is to be explained by the identity of Oriental customs.

There is a more remarkable parallel to the narrative in Mk 12[41ff.], Lk 21[1ff.], to which we are accustomed to give the heading "The Widow's Mite," although in reality there are two mites spoken of (λεπτὰ δύο). Van den Bergh van Eysinga,[2] following Beal,[3] cites the story from the Chinese literature of Buddhism, and regards it as the source of the Gospel narrative. "A poor widow comes into a religious assembly, begs for something to eat, and says with grateful heart, '*While others give costly gifts, I in my poverty can give nothing.*' Yet the thought occurs to her that she has still two copper coins, which she has found on a dunghill. She joyfully makes an offering of this gift for the priests. The chief priest, who, as an Arhat [*i.e.* a holy man], discerns the motives of the human heart, pays no heed to the rich gifts

[1] *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2758 f. Also Edmunds, *Gospels*, 6, cites as the 27th parallel "Triumphal Entry into the Capital, with Paean," but understands by that perhaps what is referred to by Seydel, *Evangelium*, 253 f., *Buddha-Legende*, 111 f., which shows only a very general resemblance.

[2] *Einflüsse*, 50 ff.

[3] *Abstract of Four Lectures on Buddhist Literature in China*, 1882, 170 ff.

of others, but only to the devout spirit of the poor woman, and sings a song in her praise." In this form the story exists, of course, only in the first century of our era: but since parallels to it are to be found elsewhere, it may have been of greater antiquity. And yet it is not necessarily the basis of the Gospel story: for a widow was the most fitting instance of destitution, and the fact that she has two pieces of money means only that she might have kept back the half of her gift.

But must we not, with Jacobi, derive the parable of the Talents (or Minae), Mt $25^{14ff.}$, Lk $19^{11ff.}$, from the Buddhist parable preserved in the Gaina Sûtras (*Uttarâdhyayana*, 7. 14 f., *Sacred Books*, xlv. 29)? It runs thus: "*Three merchants set out on their travels, each with his capital; one of them gained there much, the second returned with his capital, and the third merchant came home after having lost his capital. This parable is taken from common life; learn (to apply it) to the Law.*" Thus the interpretation at all events is different, but even the parables themselves have very little resemblance to one another. "Apart from the number of merchants or servants," Jülicher[1] says truly, "the two versions have ultimately nothing in common: in the Indian account the merchants go to a foreign country, in Mt 25 they clearly remain at home; in the Indian they trade with their own capital, in Mt 25 with what is entrusted to them by their master; different results in industrial and particularly in mercantile life suggest themselves as naturally to every creator of parables as light and darkness, sun, water, rain, fire, trees, grass, sesame-seed, jewels, father and children, sowing and harvest. The absence of such coincidences between the immense number of Indian stories and those of the Gospels would astonish us much more than their presence tempts us to suppose that there has been borrowing on one side or the other." And in other points also, such a dependence upon Buddhism as is alleged, above all, for the narratives that we have just discussed, has hitherto been nowhere demonstrated.

[1] *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, i. (1888), ²1899, 176; cp. ii., 1899, 484.

d. The Passion and Resurrection.

We have already spoken incidentally (p. 189) of the darkness that attended the death of Jesus (Mk 15^{33} and par.). A similar feature is described as marking the decease of Rabbis; and, as has been shown by Wetstein [1] and Strauss,[2] more recently by Usener [3] and Jeremias,[4] there are also prior reports in the Gentile world that favourites of heaven died amid such accompaniments. According to Pseudo-Servius (*Servii Comm.*, rec. Thilo et Hagen, iii. 2. 273), the darkness on the occasion of Caesar's death lasted also *ab hora sexta usque in noctem*; but this close agreement with Mk 15^{33} and par. is to be explained by the fact that an eclipse of the sun beginning at midday is, of course, particularly striking. Earthquakes also are mentioned on such occasions, just as in Mt 27^{51}; and it is at all events more natural to think of such prototypes, than to assert here, as Seydel does,[5] a dependence upon Buddhism (*Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta*, 6. 14, *Sacred Books*, xi. 116). But perhaps the description resolves itself into a figurative mode of speech: the sun appeared to have set, and the whole world to be tottering.

Seydel compares with the missionary command at the close of Matthew's Gospel the conclusion of the Buddhist Sûtras, *e.g.* of the *Lalita Vistara* (27, trad. par Foucaux, i. 373 f.), which always consisted of a recommendation of the book: but that is something essentially different. Of the baptismal formula and its triadic nature we have already spoken (pp. 204, 214).

In the stories of the appearances of the risen Jesus, Gunkel [6] is confident that there is a mythological element. "The primeval note," he says, "is especially manifest in the story of the disciples journeying to Emmaus: Christ appears there as an unknown wayfarer (in the same way as the deity in early times delighted to wander among men in simple

[1] *Nov. Test.* i. 537 ff.
[2] *Leben Jesu*, ii. 555 f. [Eng. trans. iii. 279 f.].
[3] "Beiläufige Bemerkungen," *Rhein. Museum*, 1900, 286 f.
[4] *Babylonisches*, 103 f.; cp. also A. Meyer, *Die Auferstehung Christi*, 1905, 5.
[5] *Evangelium*, 281; *Buddha-Legende*, 122. [6] *Verständnis*, 71.

human form, perhaps disguised as a traveller), and reveals His mysterious divine being by specific traits: but as soon as He is recognized He vanishes. This scheme of the story closely corresponds with the earliest narratives of appearances of the deity: so far as the style is concerned, the story might belong to the Book of Genesis!" . But this argument does not prove what it is intended to prove: one may also explain the narratives in another way, without necessarily supposing any such original.

We meet a more successful line of discussion when Seydel[1] attempts to derive from Buddhism the statement in 1 Co 15^6, that after showing Himself to Cephas and the Twelve, Jesus appeared to more than five hundred brethren. For, "according to the *Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta* (6. 9, *Sacred Books*, xi. 114), that is precisely the number of the assembled 'brethren' to whom Buddha addresses his last words, and in whose presence he expires. Thereafter (6. 36, *ibid.* 126) the disciple Kassapa arrives also with five hundred 'brethren,' with whom he was on his way when the tidings of Buddha's death reached him. Also the first Council, which met at Râ*gagri*ha immediately after Buddha's death, was composed of five hundred adherents to the faith" (*Ḳullavagga*, xi. 1. 2, *Sacred Books*, xx. 372). But this agreement would be convincing only if the dependence of primitive Christianity upon Buddhism were established by other proofs; and established it is not.

The interval of forty days, which according to Ac 1^3 elapsed between the resurrection and the ascension, has also been closely examined: and Winckler,[2] Zimmern,[3] and Cheyne,[4] assuming that this period originally preceded the resurrection, would trace it back to a supposed myth, in which the deity of light was represented as being, like the Pleiades, invisible for forty days. But even if the assumption just mentioned were warranted, there would be no proof, as we have seen, of the existence of a myth so fully detailed. Indeed we do not even know whether the Babylonians supposed that the Pleiades were invisible for forty days: in reality the period

[1] *Evangelium*, 285, n. 238.
[2] *Geschichte Israels*, ii., 1900, 83 f.
[3] *Keilinschriften*, 389.
[4] *Bible Problems*, 114 f.

varies in every latitude and with every century.[1] But we have already been led from the Synoptists to the Book of Acts: and to it I therefore definitely pass.

Appendix: The Primitive Church.

The narrative of the miracle at Pentecost in Ac 2 is traced by Weber[2] and Seydel[3] to a Buddhist tradition, of which Seydel gives the following account: "It is a glorious evening, lovely as a young maiden, when Buddha's first audience assembles: the gods flock thither until the heavens are empty, and all the worlds in which there are living beings are made void of life: for all are gathered in an innumerable company: but they listened to him as noiselessly as an unruffled sea. And then each of the countless listeners thought that the sage was looking towards *him* and was speaking to *him* in his own tongue, though the language used was the dialect of Magadha." However, it cannot be proved that this tradition is pre-Christian: and even if that were possible, the story would describe a miracle of hearing, not of speech. The account in Acts, on the other hand, can be fully explained by the well-known Jewish legend that the Law was given at Sinai in seventy different tongues, in order to make it intelligible to all peoples. Glossolalia, such as actually manifested itself at the first Christian Pentecost, and afterwards made its appearance especially in the Corinthian Church, has already been discussed (p. 210 f.).

In the statement of Ac 4^{31}: "*When they had prayed, the place was shaken wherein they were gathered,*" we really encounter a view derived from the Gentile world. To the parallels cited by Wetstein[4] (among which, I may remark, there appears Is 6^4: "*The foundations of the thresholds were moved at the voice of him that cried,*" which is of a different

[1] Cp. also Roscher, "Die Zahl 40 in Glauben, Brauch u. Schrift der Semiten," *Abhandlungen der königl. sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philol.-histor. Klass.*, 1909, xxvii. pt. 4.

[2] "Vedische Beiträge vi.," *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1897, 605, n. 3.

[3] *Evangelium*, 248; *Buddha-Legende*, 92 f. [4] *Nov. Test.* ii. 481.

nature) one more may be added, viz. Vergil, *Aen.* iii. 90: "*Vix ea fatus eram, tremere omnia visa repente.*"

To pass to a weightier topic—W. B. Smith derives from what he consequently regards as the most important passage in early Christian literature (viz. Ac 18^{25}: "*Apollos taught carefully the things concerning Jesus, knowing only the baptism of John*") his theory of a pre-Christian Jesus, who, he supposes, was worshipped as God among Jews and particularly among Hellenists in the two centuries before and after the beginning of our era.[1] But, like the other passages adduced by him, which I do not require to discuss,[2] this passage also is unequal to the demands made upon it. The inconsistency which the words present is rather to be removed by treating ἐπιστάμενος μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου as an unhistorical addition to the original statement in the source here drawn upon.[3] Even here, therefore, one cannot speak of non-Jewish influences on Christology: at a later point, however, they have probably to be admitted.

B.—PAULINE THEOLOGY.

1. The Person and Work of Christ.

By declaring that He would come again to judge the world, Jesus raised Himself above ordinary humanity; and this exaltation was still more pronounced in the early Church. Yet it was Paul who first described Him as the Lord, in whom all

[1] *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, 6 ff. In regard to the similar theory of Robertson, which Drews (*Christusmythe*, 20 ff.) and Lublinski (*Die Entstehung des Christentums aus der antiken Kultur*, 1910, 177 ff.) combine with this theory of Smith's, see p. 185 above. On the well-known passage in the Paris Magical Papyrus, Deissmann remarks (*Licht vom Osten*, 186, n. 14; Eng. trans. 256, n. 4): "The name Jesus as part of the formula can hardly be ancient. It was probably inserted by some pagan: no Christian, still less a Jew, would have called Jesus 'the God of the Hebrews.'"

[2] Cp. Clemen, *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, 1907, 328; also Weinel, *Ist das "liberale" Christusbild widerlegt?* 91 ff., 103 f.; Dietze, *Kritische Bemerkungen zur neuesten Auflage von A. Drews "Christusmythe,"* 1910, 37 ff. The arguments apply also to Bolland, *De evangelische Jozua*, and Brückner, *Gottheiland* 39 f.

[3] For details, cp. Clemen, *Paulus*, 1904, i. 277 ff.

things are wrought; it was Paul who not only put Him beside God, but, according to what is by far the most probable interpretation of Ro 9^5, also called Him God. This, however, can be fully explained by the peculiar experiences of the Apostle. As he had been converted by a Christophany, he was bound in other ways also to attribute the greatest significance to the risen Lord—greater significance than any one had previously ascribed. And—to add another point—it was by Paul that subsequent writers, and in particular the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, were influenced in their turn.

But if Paul and others described Jesus as also Lord and God, they were in this respect (and in the application of a corresponding title to angels in 1 Co $8^{5f.}$) certainly influenced by the manner in which these ideas were then commonly employed among the Greeks. What we read later in the Hermetic writings (2. 16, cp. 10. 25): *θεοὶ μὲν οὖν οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες ἀθάνατοι λέγονται τετιμημένοι τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ προσηγορίᾳ, ὁ δὲ θεὸς τὸ ἀγαθόν, οὐ κατὰ τιμήν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ φύσιν*, was the prevailing view even at an earlier time. But it certainly influenced Paul only so far as it suggested to him the terms *θεός* and *κύριος*: his conception of Jesus expressed by them rested securely for him on other grounds. At the most, one may surmise, with Deissmann,[1] "that the Christians of the East who heard Paul preach in the style of Ph $2^{9.\ 11}$ and 1 Co $8^{5f.}$, must have found in the solemn confession that Jesus Christ is 'the Lord' a silent protest against other 'lords,' and against 'the lord,' as people were beginning to call the Roman Caesar. And Paul himself must have felt and intended this silent protest—as well as Jude, when he calls Jesus Christ 'our *only* master and Lord.'"

Even the belief in the pre-existence of Jesus was for Paul primarily the consequence of his personal experiences and his Jewish mode of thought. Without them he would, I believe, have regarded Jesus, who had attained such significance for him, as existing from the beginning merely in the counsel of God: but with them, the ideal pre-existence became a real one, such a pre-existence indeed—and this point has been already referred to (p. 150 f.)—as Jewish thought ascribed

[1] *Licht vom Osten*, 257 [Eng. trans. 359].

to the Messiah. Even the expressions "the image of God" (*εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ*, 2 Co 4^4, Col 1^{15}), "the effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance" (*ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*, He 1^3), are to be found there. True, they are not terms applied to the Messiah, but to other intermediary beings, of whom we have either already seen or shall soon see that they were identified with the Messiah, viz. Wisdom (Wis 7^{26}) and the Logos (Philo, *De Opif. M.* 8, ed. Mangey, i. 6, and elsewhere). Moreover, it is commonly thought that these expressions may be explained simply by Gn $1^{26f.}$, "*Let us make man after our image*," and that the image of God in that passage was understood as an intermediary being. But that was not the case, at all events not universally: for Paul in 1 Co 11^7 calls man directly the image and glory of *God*: he therefore, I believe, knows nothing of an intermediary being in whose likeness man was created. Hence it is *possible* that this idea comes from another school of thought. Not, however, from the Babylonian, in which Hehn[1] finds a comparable element in the description of Marduk as the son of Mummu, *i.e.* of the archetype. But this expression does not correspond even to the designation of Christ or of other intermediary beings as the image of God, and, besides, it could hardly have influenced later Judaism, where we first find this designation: accordingly we cannot derive it from that source. One might with more justification compare, as Wendland[2] does, the description of Ptolemy Epiphanes on the Rosetta Stone (*CIG* 4697. 3) as the living image of Zeus (*εἰκὼν ζῶσα τοῦ Διός*): but in Jewish thought the Messiah or any other intermediary being would hardly, I think, have been described in the same terms as a living prince. Is it possible then that the Hermetic literature, in which we have found (p. 158) a similar expression for the Primal Man, exercises an influence here also? Or is the expression to be traced simply to Gn 1, although its origin had subsequently passed out of mind?

[1] *Hymnen u. Gebete an Marduk*, 1903, 6, 23, 27.

[2] In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 76, n. 9. Aall, *Der Logos*, ii., 1899, 22, points also to the saying of Diogenes the Cynic in Diogenes Laertius (*Vit. Philos.* vi. 2. 51): *τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας θεῶν εἰκόνας εἶναι.*

A similar view may be taken of the conception of Jesus as the creator and preserver of the world—an idea which we first find in Paul, and can certainly not derive either from his personal experiences or directly from Judaism. For it is only a possibility that 2 Esdras in the words that are put in the mouth of the Lord ($6^{1ff.}$): "*In the beginning, when the earth was made . . . then did I consider these things, and they all were made through me alone*," is assailing a Jewish speculation that regarded the Messiah as the creator of the world: the passage may just as well be directed, if not against the corresponding Christian view, then against Jewish angelology.[1] But although we cannot prove, we can surely without any difficulty *assume*, the existence of such a Jewish speculation regarding the Messiah. Like Wisdom (Wis 7^{22} 8^{5} 9^{9}), the Logos (Philo, *De Cherub.* 35, ed. Mangey, i. 162), or the archangel Michael,[2] the Messiah also could be represented as the maker and preserver of the world, as soon as God was thought of as so transcendent that man no longer ventured to attribute such functions to Him. If we think, however, that another religion may have contributed to this idea, it would be a mistake to refer, with Zimmern,[3] to the conception of Marduk as creator of the world. For such an idea can hardly have influenced Judaism, at any rate directly, at the time when Judaism would have been responsive to it; and we know nothing of a form more congenial to Judaism that the idea could have assumed elsewhere. And, in truth, there is absolutely no need to suppose any such foreign influence, for Judaism could very well originate that view on its own account.

How such a pre-existent God-like being could become man, was even for Paul a problem of some difficulty, which he attempted to solve by the supposition that Jesus took on Him only the likeness of our sinful flesh (*ὁμοίωμα σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*, Ro 8^{3}, cp. Ph 2^{7}); but that He was really *man*

[1] So Bousset, *Religion*, 381. Also Gunkel says in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen*, ii. 364, note r: "The section above is directed against the Christology of New Testament speculation or a kindred Jewish tendency": accordingly in *Verständnis*, 94, he was not justified in supposing simply the latter.

[2] Cp. Bousset, *Religion*, 377.

[3] *Keilinschriften*, 378.

was an obvious truth for one whose starting-point was the Jesus who walked upon earth, or, at any rate, died on the cross. In order to accept that doctrine or to make it intelligible to himself, he did not first require a corresponding Jewish theology of the Messiah, such as Gunkel[1] and A. Meyer[2] presuppose, although they are unable to exhibit even a trace of it. He did not need the belief in theophanies, which might have been furnished directly to him by ethnical religions, perhaps even by Hinduism (as Grill[3] supposes), although I think that in this matter Hinduism was really dependent upon Christianity: for Paul would not on any account have adopted such a belief. Nor could his Christological views derive any assistance from the idea of the transmigration of souls, to which Jülicher[4] calls attention: for that idea was not shared by Paul, so far as we can ascertain. Only in one passage does he seem, as Bousset[5] has recently pointed out, to presuppose a theory which could facilitate the development of his Christology. "The intimation which Paul gives (1 Co $2^{7ff.}$) that the rulers of this world had not recognized Jesus, is quite disconnected from the context, and is so obscure and fragmentary that we cannot possibly suppose that all the Gnostic speculations were derived from it. On the contrary, Paul *himself* must first be explained by a larger context." It is, in fact, likely that he presupposes the speculative idea of the descent of the Saviour, who in coming to this world was so transformed that he was not recognized in his true character.

For other men the acceptance of the Christology of Paul and subsequent writers may actually have been facilitated by the belief in theophanies. Such a belief was certainly in existence at the time. Although the identification of rulers, or even of priests, with gods[6] is something different, yet the Book of Acts shows that in the very *milieu* of Christianity real theophanies were still regarded as possible. Barnabas

[1] *Verständnis*, 89 ff.

[2] *Auferstehung*, 297; *Wer hat das Christentum begründet, Jesus oder Paulus?* 1907, 39 f.; and see pp. 188, 194 above.

[3] *Untersuchungen*, i. 345 ff.

[4] *Paulus u. Jesus*, 1907, 32.

[5] *Hauptprobleme*, 242, 260.

[6] In regard to this, cp. also Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 118, 176 ff., 236.

and Paul were taken for Zeus and Hermes at Lystra, and Paul was declared by the inhabitants of Malta to be a god (14$^{11ff.}$ 28^{6}). And if it might be argued that these supposed theophanies were of a temporary nature, Simon Magus was described by the Samaritans as the great power of God, that is to say, it was thought that some spiritual Being or Potency had taken up his permanent abode in him (8^{10}).[1] Thus even some Christians *may* have believed in the incarnation of their Lord more easily because they had been already accustomed to ideas of this sort: but in the case of the New Testament writers themselves, there is no need or justification for supposing this. If Paul in 2 Th 2^{8}, and (in another sense) the Pastoral Epistles, speak of the appearance of the Saviour, and in so doing clearly adopt, as Wendland[2] shows, a pagan mode of speech, it is only the *expression* that is borrowed, not the idea.

And still less did Paul or any other understand his doctrine of the work of Christ as in some degree resembling pagan myths. O. Pfleiderer[3] and Gunkel[4] hold an opposite view, but overlook the ethical character of the Christian doctrine of the atonement, which had no adequate analogue in non-Jewish religions.[5] It would be more appropriate, as A. Meyer[6] suggests, to recall the circumstance that at one time ancient kings and gods sacrificed their sons for the welfare of the people: but even this would not have impressed Paul.[7] Thus he could not, even in a secondary degree, have been confirmed in his ideas by pagan beliefs: his ideas are to be explained entirely by his Jewish presuppositions. It seemed

[1] What was related of Helen is probably subsequent in its origin; cp. Waitz, "Simon Magus in der altchristl. Literatur," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1904, 134 f. So also the similar statements regarding Dositheus; cp. Uhlhorn, art. "Dositheus der Samariter," *Prot. Realencykl.*[3] v., 1898, 2. Accordingly, Gruppe's suggestions in reference to this matter (*Mythologie*, 1612 f.) are no longer defensible.

[2] *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1904, 343, 349 f.: cp. Thieme, *Inschriften*, 34 ff., 38; Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 273 [Eng. trans. 378].

[3] *Urchristentum*, i. 332 f. [Eng. trans. i. 466 f.].

[4] *Verständnis*, 92 f.

[5] Cp. also Baudissin, art. "Tammuz," *Prot. Realencykl.*[3] xix., 1907, 369, 377.

[6] *Auferstehung*, 297.

[7] 1 Clem. 55. 1 is later.

to him that the offence of the cross could only be removed, and Jesus' preaching of the love of God could only be accepted, *if* the death of Christ was an expiation for the sins of others.

2. Isolated Passages.

The other points in the Pauline Epistles that might be, or have been, explained by the religious-historical method, I shall not endeavour to arrange under separate heads according to their subject, but shall discuss in the order in which the relative passages have probably been written.

In the first place, we have in Gal 4^{14} the words: *τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε*. Since the last expression is to be found nowhere else in a figurative sense, it would appear that we ought to think of actual spitting—which, as Krenkel[1] in particular shows, was a prophylactic custom commonly observed at the sight of invalids and especially of epileptics. If this view of the passage be accepted, Paul assumed the existence of this heathen superstition among the Galatians, but perhaps only for their pre-Christian past, of which he here speaks: one need not at all suppose that he himself shared the superstitious belief.

Wendland[2] remarks on Eph $6^{11ff.}$: "The figure of the *militia Christi* may here, as in other authors, be influenced by its antithesis to the similar figure which is often found also in Oriental religions": and the same conclusion might apply to the earlier passage, 1 Th 5^{8}. Cumont,[3] to whom Wendland refers, thinks it inconceivable that Mithraism should have influenced Christianity in this regard, and points out more definitely "Qu'au moins sous l'Empire, les mystes d'Isis sont regardés aussi comme formant des cohortes sacrées, engagées au service de la déesse, qu'antérieurement dans la philosophie stoïcienne l'existence humaine est souvent comparée à une campagne, et que même les astrologues appellent l'homme qui se soumet aux ordres du Destin, en

[1] *Beiträge zur Aufhellung der Geschichte u. der Briefe des Paulus*, 1890, 47 ff.
[2] In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 172, n. 4.
[3] *Les religions*, xiii. ff.

renonçant à toute révolte, le soldat de la Fatalité." For Paul, however (and the writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians), there was a more obvious source in Wis 5^{19}, which goes back in its turn to the corresponding description of God in Is 59^{17}.

In 1 Co 5^{5}, Paul says that he has delivered the *incestuosus* unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. If he anticipates, therefore, that the sinner will die, this idea is connected, as is shown in particular by von Dobschütz[1] and Deissmann,[2] with the belief in the operation of the curse: and this belief is assumed also in the narratives of the death of Sapphira and the sudden blinding of Bar-Jesus (Ac $5^{9f.}$ 13^{11}), as well as in the words of 1 Ti 1^{20}, "*whom I delivered unto Satan, that they might be taught not to blaspheme.*" It is to be found also in the Old Testament and in Jewish thought (Jer $28^{16f.}$, 1 Mac $9^{54ff.}$), but might be collaterally derived from non-Jewish influences—like the idea that death (not, as in 1 Ti 1^{20}, other afflictions, which were to have an instructive effect) would expiate sins and so cause the spirit to be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. This was again, of course, the teaching of Judaism, but, above all, as Böklen,[3] Söderblom,[4] and Moffatt[5] observe, of Parsism: and as we have on earlier pages repeatedly assured ourselves of the influence of Parsism in this very region of eschatology, that influence is probably to be admitted here as well. When von Dobschütz finally cites Plutarch's reflections on the non-fulfilment of the threatened curse (*De Sera Num. Vind.*), he starts from an interpretation of 2 Co $2^{5ff.}$ $7^{8ff.}$ which I cannot regard as correct.

When Paul in Ph 2^{10} says that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of beings in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, we must think of angelic beings: and therefore by the place under the earth we must understand not Sheol, but some other locality—just as also in Rev 5^{3}, "*No*

[1] *Die urchristlichen Gemeinden*, 1902, 270 f. [Eng. trans., *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, 1904, 389 ff.].

[2] *Licht vom Osten*, 218 f. [Eng. trans. 303 f.].

[3] *Verwandtschaft*, 15 f.

[4] *La vie future d'après le Mazdéisme*, 1901, 117, 131 f.

[5] *Hibb. Journ.*, 1902–3, i. 771.

one in the heaven, or on the earth, or under the earth, was able to open the book, or to look thereon." This distinction meets us also in the Old Testament, particularly in Ex 20^4 (Dt 5^8): "*Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, nor the likeness of any form that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth*": and in the same way we hear elsewhere of this water under the earth. But the idea did not arise in Israel: it must have come from another country, more plentifully supplied with water. And, in fact, we find it, as well as the threefold division into heaven, earth, and water, in Babylonia.[1] Accordingly it is from Babylonia, as Zimmern,[2] Jeremias,[3] and Wilke[4] rightly suppose, that that mode of expression, even in the Epistle to the Philippians and in the Apocalypse, is ultimately derived.

If we may deal at this point with the spurious doxology at the close of the Epistle to the Romans, there is to be found in it (16^{26}) one expression which, however obvious it may seem, might still be of foreign origin—the expression "eternal God." "Toujours," says Cumont,[5] "quand on trouve dans les provinces latines une dédicace à un *deus aeternus* il s'agit d'un dieu sidéral syrien et, fait remarquable, ce n'est qu'au IIe siècle de notre ère que cette épithète entre dans l'usage rituel. . . . Les prêtres syriens vulgarisèrent dans le monde romain l'idée que Dieu est sans commencement et sans fin, et contribuèrent ainsi, parallèlement au prosélytisme juif, à donner l'autorité d'un dogme religieux à ce qui n'était auparavant qu'une théorie métaphysique." But we must add that the expression may be derived also from Jewish thought, for we find it in Bar 4^8, Sus $^{35\,(42)}$. Or does the similarity which one observes particularly between the doxology and

[1] Also in the Naassenic sermon in Hippolytus (*Philos.* v. 7) it is of the Assyrians that it is said: *πᾶσα φύσις ἐπουρανίων, φησί, καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων ψυχῆς ὀρέγεται.*

[2] *Keilinschriften*, 615.

[3] *Das A.T.* 8, 174 f. [Eng. trans. i. 8, 189 f.].

[4] *Die astralmythologische Weltanschauung u. das A.T.*, 1907, 17. The explanation offered by König, *Altorientalische Weltanschauung u. Altes Testament* (1905), 10 f., is much less probable.

[5] *Les religions*, 156 f.

the conclusion of the *Martyrium Polycarpi* (20^2), point to a Gentile-Christian origin? At all events it would then be nothing more than an *expression* borrowed from a foreign religion: the idea itself is, of course, Christian and even Jewish. Another point should perhaps be mentioned here —the description of God and Christ as τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ in Rev 1^8 21^6 22^{13}. Reitzenstein,[1] who claims the support of Boll,[2] would unnecessarily derive this from non-Jewish thought. But even Boll says: "There is hardly any doubt that this method of putting *A* and *Ω* at the first and most prominent place, originates in well-known passages of the Apocalypse of John."

Appendix: Post-Pauline Writings.

If here also we examine the individual passages in the order in which they have probably been written, we ought in all likelihood to start with the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the first place, in 6^4 those who entered the fellowship of the Church are described as having been once enlightened, as having tasted of the heavenly gift, as having been made partakers of the Holy Ghost. As Wobbermin[3] has most recently shown, the expression φωτίζειν, which also occurs in 10^{32} and then in Eph 1^{18} 3^9, 2 Ti 1^{10}, is borrowed from the language of the Mysteries: and this is the more probable seeing that in the Mysteries there was also a sacred meal, and in He 6^4 "tasting" and "enlightenment" are associated.

When Jesus in He 8^6 9^{15} 12^{24} and likewise in 1 Ti 2^5 is called the mediator, Cumont[4] would have us think of the analogous designation of Mithras. But that had primarily a different sense. "Mithra," says Cumont[5] himself, "était pour les anciens mages le dieu de la lumière, et comme la lumière est portée par l'air il était censé habiter la zone

[1] *Poimandres*, 286: cp. also W. Bauer, *Handkommentar zum N.T.* iv. (1891), ^{3}1908, 424; Heitmüller, *A und O*, *Die Religion*, i. 1.

[2] *Sphaera*, 471.

[3] *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, 1896, 154 ff. What Gruppe compares instead of this (*Mythologie*, 1616) has much less resemblance.

[4] *Textes*, i. 340. [5] *Ibid.* 303; cp. also 228.

mitoyenne entre le ciel et les enfers, et on lui donnait pour ce motif le nom de μεσίτης . . ." And though it must at the same time be said, "Mithra est le 'médiateur' entre le dieu inaccessible et inconnaissable, qui règne dans les sphères éthérées, et le genre humain, qui s'agite et souffre ici bas," still an influence from this quarter is much less probable than from Jewish thought, where Moses is so called (Test. Dan 6, Ass. Mos 1^{14}; Philo, *Vita Mos.* iii. 19, ed. Mangey, ii. 160; cp. also Gal 3^{19}): and for the idea expressed in these passages there is no need to seek for a foreign original.

Further, the description of Jesus as the great Shepherd of the sheep, He 13^{20}, is commonly explained by a reference to Is 63^{11}, where Moses is similarly spoken of; while the epithet μέγας has its parallels in the expression "great high priest" or "great priest," He 4^{14} 10^{21}. But it is surely worthy of note that Jesus—for the words are, I think, to be referred to Him—is also called the Shepherd of your souls in 1 P 2^{25}, and in 1 P 5^{4} the chief Shepherd. No doubt these last phrases may be explained (without reference to He 13^{20}) by the passage[1] in Ezk 34, which otherwise bears a strong resemblance to 1 P 2^{25}: and 1 P 5^{4} is sufficiently accounted for by its context. But there is still another passage, Jn $10^{11.\ 14}$, "*I am* THE *good Shepherd.*" For in this, as in other and similar expressions of which we have still to speak, it is intended, I think, to contrast Jesus with some one who unwarrantably bears this name: such a one might therefore, as Gunkel[2] conjectures, be alluded to also in 1 P 2^{25} 5^{4}. Now, do we know of such a person in the *milieu* of primitive Christianity? We are probably not justified in thinking of Yima, "the beautiful and good shepherd": at any rate in Judaism, on which alone Parsism could have had an immediate influence, the designation of the Messiah as the Shepherd is not common.[3] It would be more natural to suppose that the cult of Attis, who was

[1] Cp. Ezk 34^{11} (LXX): ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐκζητήσω τὰ πρόβατά μου καὶ ἐπισκέψομαι αὐτά.

[2] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 46, 58.

[3] The late-Jewish work "The True Shepherd," which is mentioned by Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 12, n. 3 (following Karppe, *Étude sur les origines et la nature du Zohar*, 331), does not, of course, require to be considered.

frequently so described,[1] had directly influenced Christianity: but no strong case for this theory has yet been made out. Accordingly Reitzenstein[2] would have us think of "the shepherd in the West," who appears in an interesting magical invocation; but, above all, of the Poimandres of the Hermetic literature. We have already seen that that literature influenced Christianity in this very respect: consequently, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the First Epistle of Peter, and particularly in the Gospel of John (where, as we shall see, there are other affinities), we may derive the term "shepherd" also from that literature. The word ἀρχιποίμην, on the other hand, recalls the ἀρχιβούκολος in the Dionysiac Mysteries,[3] and was perhaps a common expression in other connexions.

In 1 P 2[2] the figurative reference to milk is, according to Gunkel,[4] "perhaps originally [derived] from some custom of giving milk to one newly initiated into the Mysteries." This custom is, in fact, attested by Sallustius Philosophus (*De Diis et Mundo*, 4), whereas Reinach's[5] interpretation of the old formula or symbolum used by the participants in the Dionysiac Mysteries in Lower Italy, ἔριφος ἐς γάλα ἔπετον, *je suis devenu chevreau et j'ai trouvé du lait*, is rightly described by Dieterich[6] as problematical. Indeed, Hepding[7] even asserts regarding the milk mentioned by Sallustius that it must have been mixed with honey—as we read in the Berlin Magical Book,[8] λαβὼν τὸ γάλα σὺν τῷ [μέλι]τι ἀπόπιε πρὶν ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου, καὶ ἔσται τι ἔνθεον ἐν τῇ σῇ καρδίᾳ. Yet this would not be decisive against that

[1] Cp. Hepding, *Attis*, 206 f. [2] *Poimandres*, 31, n. 3, 245.

[3] Cp. Cumont, *Textes*, i. 315, n. 6. But I should not, with Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 64 f. [Eng. trans. 97 ff.], compare with this the ἀρχιποίμενος "found on a slip of wood that once hung round the neck of an Egyptian mummy," nor should I assert, with him: "The Christians called their Saviour 'the chief Shepherd,' but this was not crowning him with jewelled diadem of gold: it was more like plaiting a wreath of simple green leaves to adorn his brow."

[4] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 38.

[5] "Une formule orphique," *Rev. archéol.*, 1901, ii. 202 ff.

[6] *Mithrasliturgie*, 171. [7] *Attis*, 197 f.

[8] Cp. Parthey, "Zwei griech. Zauberpapyri des Berl. Museums" (*Philol. u. hist.*) *Abh. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1865, 120, n. 20.

explanation of 1 P 2^2 which we are now discussing: for both in Sallustius and here the reference to honey may have been omitted. But the words, "*As new-born babes, long for the spiritual milk which is without guile*," may easily be understood without that parallel: milk is the very food of children.

There is still less need to suppose, with Gunkel,[1] that the description of Jesus as the "living stone," 1 P 2^4, is based on a mythological conception, of which there is in reality no evidence. The term "stone" comes from the passage in the Psalms which is here drawn upon (118^{22}): as, however, in its original form it was not appropriate to Jesus, it had to be supplemented by the word "living."

When Gunkel[2] finds in the close association of God and king in 1 P 2^{17} a last relic of the deification of kings common in the primeval East, this is in any distinct sense true only of the manner in which they are associated in the Book of Proverbs (24^{21}): but in 1 Peter the words are "FEAR *God*. HONOUR *the King*."[3]

In regard to the Epistle to the Ephesians, Reitzenstein[4] traces the description of the Church as πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου, 1^{23} (cp. 3^{19} 4^{13}), to the Hermetic literature. But there the expression has another sense. The world is πλήρωμα τῆς ζωῆς (9. 7, 12. 15), or even τῆς κακίας, as God is τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ (6. 4); and with this idea we might in general, if we may mention this point at once, compare Jn 1^{16} ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν. On the other hand, the passages in the Epistle to the Ephesians are explained, like so many others, most simply by the Epistle to the Colossians: in Col 2^{10} Christians are called ἐν αὐτῷ [*i.e.* Χριστῷ] πεπληρωμένοι, and of Christ Himself it is said in 1^{19} 2^9 that in Him dwells πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα [τῆς θεότητος]: accordingly the writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians also describes Christians them-

[1] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 39. [2] *Ibid.* 44.

[3] Cp. also Weinel, *Die Stellung des Urchristentums zum Staat*, 44: "One must not misunderstand the concluding sentence of this passage as if it set the Emperor alongside of God. They are antithetical clauses: *Honour* all men, *love* the brotherhood; *fear* God, *honour* the king."

[4] *Poimandres*, 25, n. 1.

selves as πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου. No doubt the term πλήρωμα might indirectly be of pagan origin, especially if it came to Paul from the heretical teachers of Colossae: but in this sense we cannot yet prove its existence elsewhere. For this reason I have not mentioned it at all in my discussion of the Pauline Epistles.

Reitzenstein,[1] Lueken,[2] and Wendland[3] trace also the words of Eph 3^{18}, "*That ye may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth,*" to a formula that sometimes occurs in pagan conjurations. Thus, *e.g.* in such a prayer, during the utterance of which one had probably to gaze into a bright light till he believed that he saw in it the god or certain symbols, we have the words, ἀνοιγήτω μοι ὁ οἶκος τοῦ παντοκράτορος θεοῦ ὁ ἐν τῷ φωτὶ τούτῳ, καὶ γενέσθω φῶς πλάτος βάθος μῆκος ὕψος αὐγή, καὶ διαλαμψάτω ὁ ἔσωθεν, ὁ κύριος. Reitzenstein considers this resemblance particularly close, because the Epistle to the Ephesians also assumes that there is a temple in the heart which God entirely fills. But this view, which has come originally from von Soden,[4] is hardly tenable: if $3^{14ff.}$, as this scholar shows, takes up $1^{15ff.}$, one must for that very reason connect the apprehension of the breadth, length, height, and depth with what is said in $1^{18f.}$, viz. that the Ephesians are to know "*what is the hope of his calling, what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe.*" And if even then the enumeration of four dimensions should be surprising, it ought to be observed, first, that in the conjurations referred to, the jingling substantives πλάτος and βάθος are put side by side, whereas in the Epistle to the Ephesians they are separated: secondly, and more important still, that there were certainly other instances of the combinations of these dimensional terms, and that therefore the expressions are not necessarily derived from such formulae.

To proceed now to the Pastoral Epistles, we read in 2 Ti 2^{19}: "*The firm foundation of God standeth, having this seal,*

[1] *Poimandres*, 25, n. 1. [2] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 2. 124.
[3] In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 172, n. 4.
[4] *Handkommentar zum N.T.* iii. 1, 1891, 80 f., 128.

The Lord knoweth them that are his: and, Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness." Like the passage in Rev 21[14], this refers to the pagan custom of engraving an inscription on the foundation-stone; but although this was originally done for superstitious ends, one can hardly suppose that there is any such notion in the Epistle before us.

On the other hand, it is really a pagan conception that is drawn upon when "every scripture" is characterized as "inspired of God" (2 Ti 3[16]). For that is the correct translation of the term *θεόπνευστος*: and, as Cremer[1] discerned, the idea implied comes neither from the Old Testament, nor from Jewish theology proper, but from paganism. "It is paganism alone that knows a *θεοφόρητος μανία*, as Philo also terms ecstasy, to which in the Biblical sense, and understood precisely, only the idea of 'possession' would correspond. It is not altogether accurate to attribute the idea with which Philo is dealing, exclusively to his Platonizing. Other causes, perhaps the influences of Oriental religions, may have contributed to this result," and these influences Reitzenstein[2] in particular has recently indicated.

On Tit 3[4] "*When the kindness of God our Saviour, and his love toward man, appeared,*" Wendland[3] remarks: "There is hardly any virtue so often commended in the Hellenistic sovereign as *φιλανθρωπία*." At the same time, however, he and Thieme[4] point out that such laudation was connected with the ancient worship of sovereigns: thus the expression may the more easily have been applied to "God our Saviour."

The genealogies mentioned in Tit 3[9] and 1 Ti 1[4] are certainly to be associated with the series of aeons, which were a favourite idea of those Gnostics who were assailed in the Pastoral Epistles and the Epistles still to be discussed. And undoubtedly the Gnostics, in this as well as in other respects, were influenced by pagan beliefs: but the writer of the Pastoral

[1] Art. "Inspiration," *Prot. Realencykl.*[3] ix., 1901, 187.

[2] *Poimandres*, 204, 222 ff.

[3] In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, i. 2. 76, n. 14; cp. also *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1904, 344 f.

[4] *Inschriften*, 38.

Epistles rejects their views. Further, the designation of God as the *βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων*, 1^{17}, was not necessarily chosen, as F. Köhler[1] maintains, "with a manifest allusion to the Gnostics, who dream of aeon-genealogies," but may have come from Jewish thought, where it meets us already in Sir 36^{19} and To $13^{6.10}$. In the same way, the title *βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων*, 1 Ti 6^{15} (cp. Rev 17^{14} 19^{16}), finds a prototype more readily in Dt 10^{17}, Ps 136^{3}, 2 Mac 13^{4}, than in the similar designation of Marduk, which Gunkel,[2] Zimmern,[3] Bousset,[4] and Weinel[5] compare. Even the *φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον* of 1 Ti 6^{16} probably comes from Ps 104^{2}, and the expression *πατὴρ τῶν φώτων, παρ' ᾧ οὐκ ἔνι παραλλαγὴ ἢ τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα* in Ja 1^{17} does not require to be traced to the astrological religion of Babylon.

With Ja 1^{18}, *βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας*, one might compare a passage (the unity of which, however, is denied by Reitzenstein[6]) in the *Poimandres*, 8 f., 12: *ἐκ βουλῆς θεοῦ [τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς φύσεως ὑπέστη], ἥτις λαβοῦσα τὸν λόγον καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν καλὸν κόσμον ἐμιμήσατο . . . ὁ δὲ Νοῦς, ὁ θεὸς . . . ἀπεκύησε λόγῳ ἕτερον Νοῦν δημιουργόν . . . ὁ δὲ πάντων πατὴρ ὁ Νοῦς . . . ἀπεκύησεν Ἄνθρωπον αὐτῷ ἴσον.* But though the expressions are identical, the point of this passage is different: from the verbal agreement one can only infer that these terms were frequently used in certain circles. Finally, the expression *θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως* in 2 P 1^{4} has been connected with a phrase from an inscription of King Antiochus I. of Commagene discovered at Selik—an inscription which is of a religious character and therefore deserves mention here. The phrase that appears there is *ὅσοι φύσεως κοινωνοῦντες ἀνθρωπίνης*: but, *pace* Deissmann,[7] the supposed connexion between the two appears to me very doubtful; at all events it would be only the expression, not the idea, that is borrowed. Deissmann, however, is more successful with another of the connexions that he traces. The first half of 2 P 1 bears a close resemblance to the beginning

[1] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 2. 159.
[2] *Schöpfung*, 307, n. 3.
[3] *Keilinschriften*, 373 f.
[4] *Offenbarung*, 409.
[5] *Stellung*, 22.
[6] *Poimandres*, 37 ff.
[7] *Bibelstudien*, 284, n. 3 [*Bible Studies*, 368, n. 2].

of an inscription which dates from early Imperial times, and contains a decree passed by the inhabitants of Stratonicea in Caria in honour of Zeus Panhemerios and Hecate. I shall, first of all, place the two texts side by side, and indicate parallel phrases by the mode of printing:

τοῦ γραμματέως τῆς βουλῆς εἰπόντος τὴν πόλιν ἄνωθεν τῇ τῶν προεστώτων αὐτῆς μείστων θεῶν [προνοίᾳ . . .] . . . ἐκ πολλῶν . . . κινδύνων σεσῶσθαι ὧν καὶ . . . ἡ ἱερὰ σύγκλητος δόγματι Σε[βαστοῦ Καίσαρος ἐπὶ] τῆς τῶν κυρίων Ῥωμαίων αἰωνίου ἀρχῆς ἐποιήσαντο προφανεῖς ἐναργείας· καλῶς δὲ ἔχι πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ἰσφέρεσθαι ἰς τὴν πρὸς [αὐτοὺς εὐσέβ]ειαν . . . καθίδρυται δὲ ἀγάλματα . . . τῶν προειρημένω[ν θεῶν ἐπιφαν]εστάτας παρέχοντα τῆς θείας δυνάμεως ἀρετάς, δι' ἃς καὶ τὸ σύμπαν πλῆθος θύει τε καὶ ἐπιθυμᾷ κτλ.

ὡς τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν δεδωρημένης διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια ἡμῖν καὶ μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν . . . οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Deissmann further compares, but only "with the utmost caution" the *ἀγάλματα* and *ἐπιθυμιᾷ* of the inscription with the *ἐπαγγέλματα* and *ἐπιθυμίᾳ* of the Epistle: but on that we need not dwell. At all events the general agreement of the two texts—for even *μέγιστος* occurs nowhere else in the New Testament—is not accidental. It would appear, therefore, that if the writer of the Second Epistle of Peter had not read this very inscription, he was still indebted, like it, to certain "familiar forms and formulae of religious emotion." But even if this be granted, it would again mean only that certain *formulae* were employed in a new connexion: it would not follow that there had been a real appropriation of *ideas*.

C.—THE IDEAS OF THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS.

1. Johannine Theology in General.

Reitzenstein,[1] with hearty assent from Soltau[2] and a qualified approval from Heitmüller,[3] would derive not the

[1] *Fragen*, 71 ff.; *Poimandres*, 244 ff. [2] *Fortleben*, 151 f.

[3] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 174 f., 190, 192. A. Meyer (*Theol. Rundschau*, 1902, 326), following Stapfer, points out also that Michel as early

Johannine theology in its entirety, but the form which it assumes in the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John, from the Hermetic literature, to which we have more than once appealed. We have seen that such a derivation would be possible in itself: but we may note in particular that in the Johannine writings it is those expressions which (as Heitmüller was the first to point out clearly) play a leading part on both sides that require to be traced to such a foreign provenance.

Thus the conspicuous place which the ideas of "life" and "light" occupy in the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John—and that is the important thing, not merely their presence there—cannot, in spite of Grill's[1] arguments, be derived from the Old Testament. If we would search farther afield, we may at once pass over the Vedânta philosophy, which regards all life as only seeming existence, and Orphism, which merely makes the process of evolution begin with Protogonos Phanes. Nor can the origin that we seek be found in Philo, of whom one would be tempted to think first of all, in view of what has been remarked above (p. 74) regarding the Logos. Grill[2] himself shows that in Philo's writings the ideas in question are found occasionally, and even in combination with one another: "but one cannot for a moment maintain that these two ideas have a specific rôle assigned to them in the Philonic doctrine of the Logos, and that they have become fundamental notions and catchwords, in the same way as in the Fourth Gospel." On the other hand, they are always reappearing in the earlier and the later *Poimandres* (1. 9, 12, 17, 21, 32; 13. 9, 18 f.) as descriptions of *Νοῦς*, with which again the Logos is closely connected and is originally identical. From what source the Poimandres derived them we cannot say—probably even in

as 1863 taught that "one who had formerly been a pagan Gnostic must have come to John, the companion and disciple of Jesus, a calm, mystic personality: in his association with John he learned to know Jesus as the divine Word—from him he derived the historical setting: on the other hand, such Gnostic terms as light, life, darkness, pre-existence, and the unhistorical mode of presentation, are his own."

[1] *Untersuchungen*, i. 225 ff.

[2] *Ibid.* 206 ff.; cp. also Aall, *Der Logos*, ii., 1899, 82 f.

Mandaeism[1] they do not go back to Christian influences, at any rate not merely to these, but to Persian influences as well:[2] for the present, however, it is enough to have indicated the Poimandres as their proximate source. For from it even the Logos idea of the Johannine theology can be more fitly derived than from Philo: in Philo it is for the most part understood impersonally: in the Poimandres, on the other hand, it is applied to Thot-Hermes, as it is applied to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel and previously in the Apocalypse.[3] Of course, other resemblances to Philonic teaching must not on that account be neglected: and the Johannine theology—we must repeat that we are dealing only with its *formal* relations—can no more be derived directly from the Hermetic literature than from Philo.

Even the parallels that Reitzenstein further adduces are not necessarily a proof of direct connexion between the Hermetic and the Johannine literature. The omniscience of Jesus, which is conspicuous at the very first in the words

[1] Cp. Brandt, *Mand. Rel.* 134 f.

[2] There is less probability in the explanation which Miss A. Grenfell gives ("Egyptian Mythology and the Bible," *Monist*, 1906, 170): "M. Moret has shown that the goddess Maat is assimilated to the eye of Horus (the sun), and represents light. Her symbol, the ostrich feather, is read *shu*, 'light.' The gods created the world by a luminous emission from their eyes and a sonorous emission of their voice. Thus light created reality. The offering of Maat to the god by the priest-king, a ritualistic scene very commonly portrayed and of the highest importance, is to give the god all which really lives," etc.

[3] Cp. also Aall's incidental remark (*Der Logos*, ii. 78, n. 4): "We find these religious 'ideas of value' abundantly developed in the Hermetic literature"; again, Grill's supplementary note (*Untersuchungen*, i. xi. f.): "At all events it would be more natural to suppose that the Logos—in the form in which, according to the theology, and particularly to the cosmogony of Stoic-Egyptian Hellenism, it is associated with Hermes-Thot, the creative god of the Word (speech), and is conceived as a personal principle of revelation—furnished in a certain sense a helpful model and a positive starting-point for the Logos idea of the Evangelist." See, too, the criticism of A. Meyer (*Theol. Rundschau*, 1904, 528): "No doubt one must not seek the parallel to the personified Logos so much in Philo, who deals far too much with abstractions, as in the circles in which the world-reason was associated with Thot-Hermes, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἑρμηνεύεται, or with the sun. What these Egyptian priests and Christian Gnostics did with Hermes, John essayed to do with Christ; and in doing this, no doubt, like the sound Bible-student that he was, he naturally connected the λόγος more with the creative word of the Old Testament than with abstract reason."

addressed to Nathanael: "*Before Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee*" (Jn 1^{48}), and then in the interview with the woman of Samaria ($4^{17f.\ 39}$), is not necessarily to be derived from the corresponding description of *Νοῦς* (*Poim.* 1. 2): nor does the insistence on the need for the new birth (Jn 3^{3}) necessarily come straight from the words in the later *Poimandres* (1): *μηδένα δύνασθαι σωθῆναι πρὸ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας*.[1] The case is, no doubt, otherwise with the expression "Good Shepherd," of which we have already spoken (p. 346 f.): on the other hand, the statements regarding the relation of Jesus to God have certainly nothing to do with those in the Hermetic literature regarding the union between God and the regenerate man. And even the saying in Jn $14^{25f.}$: *ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν παρ' ὑμῖν μένων· ὁ δὲ παράκλητος . . . ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν*, is not necessarily connected with the words of *Poim.* 13. 2: *τοῦτο τὸ γένος . . . οὐ διδάσκεται, ἀλλ' ὅταν θέλῃ, ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναμιμνήσκεται.*

Finally, the persistent foolish misunderstandings on the part of the disciples and the Jews made even Wrede[2] think for a time that "the author had had closer acquaintance with the dialogistic literature, in which the utterances of the chief speaker were interrupted by foolish objections from the subordinate characters." He rejects this theory on the ground that the dialogistic manner (which is certainly to be found in John's Gospel) is in harmony with the Evangelist's idea that Jesus had during His earthly life promulgated the superhuman wisdom which He brought from heaven, in a mystic and allusive form. Reitzenstein, however, revives the theory, on the ground that this form is found in the same way in the Hermetic literature. But, strictly speaking, that is not the case. For in that literature the preliminary condition for complete understanding is the new birth, in John it is the sending of the Spirit; and if, apart from this, there is, as I admit, a remarkable agreement between the two, still we cannot infer that the Johannine literature is certainly dependent upon the Hermetic, and upon no other source. It

[1] For Reitzenstein's view, see his *Poimandres*, 215, n. 2.

[2] *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, 1901, 199.

is only of affinity that one can speak, and Heitmüller's caution in this matter is fully justified.

2. Isolated Passages.

As in the case of the Synoptists and Paul, I discuss here in conclusion those passages from the Johannine literature that have been derived from foreign and particularly from Buddhist sources, or that might be traced to such influences.

There are, first of all, several passages that describe Jesus as the *μονογενὴς παρὰ πατρός*, *μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* (Jn $1^{14.\ 18}$—for here also that must be the reading—$3^{16.\ 18}$, 1 Jn 4^{9}). In the metaphysical sense in which it is here employed, the term seems, as Grill[1] says, to have no previous history. Accordingly, Cheyne[2] points to the description in Epiphanius of the North-Arabian Dusares (mentioned on p. 293) as *μονογενὴς τοῦ δεσπότου*: but that description is perhaps based on a misunderstanding; for it is not a translation of the name Dusares, as Epiphanius maintains; and if it should be, as Mordtmann[3] thinks possible, a surname of the god, his cult can hardly have influenced the Gospel of John. Thus it would be still simpler to reason back from Gnosticism to an earlier speculation regarding the *μονογενής*, even if this operation cannot be shown to be absolutely necessary, and even if the origin of the speculation would still have to be sought. But, finally, one may suppose that it was in the Johannine circle itself that the expression was first used in the sense now under discussion.[4]

Next, there is the passage which tells us that two of John's disciples went over to Jesus, and that one of them, Andrew, first found his brother Simon; that thereafter Philip and Nathanael were called, and that Jesus spoke of and addressed Nathanael in these words: "*Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile! . . . Before Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee*" (Jn $1^{35ff.}$). In

[1] *Untersuchungen*, i. 362. [2] *Bible Problems*, 74.

[3] "Dusares bei Epiphanius," *Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenl. Ges.*, 1875, 101 f.

[4] In Wis 7^{22} it has probably another sense.

the opinion of Seydel,[1] with whom van den Bergh van Eysinga[2] partially agrees, all this is based upon the story of the five disciples who desert Rudraka for Buddha, and of Buddha's being called under a fig tree (*Rgya tcher rol pa*, 17 f., 26, trad. par Foucaux, ii. 235 ff., 253 ff., 382 ff.). Nevertheless van den Bergh van Eysinga says: "It is certainly no favourable token for the hypothesis of dependence, that in John the number five arises from $2+(3\times1)$, whereas in the Buddhist texts it is a small circle of five associates that is spoken of, to whom the great boon is offered simultaneously, but whose conversion takes place on five successive days." Further, in John's Gospel it is only two disciples that come over from the Baptist, who "did not eat or drink,"—Buddha, on the other hand, because of his abandonment of the fasting theory was *forsaken* by all his disciples. And still less is the saying regarding Nathanael to be compared with Buddha's judgment regarding Moggallâna-Kolita and Sâriputta-Upatissa: "*There, O Bhikkhus, two companions arrive, Kolita and Upatissa; these will be a pair of true pupils, a most distinguished, auspicious pair*" (*Mahâvagga*, i. 24. 3, *Sacred Books*, xiii. 149). The words addressed to Nathanael are, I admit, not fully intelligible to us: but are they made so by the alleged Buddhist parallel (*Rgya*, 24, trad. par Foucaux, ii. 356 ff.; cp. also *Mahâvagga*, i. 6. 5 ff., *Sacred Books*, xiii. 90 ff. and 90, n. 1)? There Buddha himself sits under the fig tree; and if, according to a Mohammedan tradition, Abubekr recognized Mohammed as sent by God because he sat under a tree under which no one else could sit after Jesus, can we conclude from this that in the original tradition Jesus Himself sat under the fig tree? Again, the fact that, according to the Ma*gghi*ma-Nikâya, Buddha is said "with his heavenly eye, the sublime and unearthly," to have seen "the company of the five monks at Benares tarrying in the thicket of the prophet's stone," is no longer of great importance if the first disciples of Jesus, as they appear in John's account, have no connexion with Buddha's five.

[1] *Evangelium*, 153 f., 168 ff.; *Buddha-Legende*, 31 f., 112 f.
[2] *Einflüsse*, 65 ff.

The story of the miracle at Cana of Galilee, Jn $2^{1ff.}$, is traced, first by Dupuis,[1] then by Barrows[2] and Robertson,[3] and last of all by Heitmüller,[4] to similar narratives regarding shrines of Dionysus. "In his temple at Elis, for example, when his festival was being held, empty pitchers were filled with wine in the course of the night: in his temple in Andros on the fifth of January wine instead of water gushed forth from a spring." Gunkel,[5] on the other hand, thinks that a mythological element is present in Jn $2^{1ff.}$ in the same way as in the narrative of the feeding of the multitude: but even if a plausible case could be made out for this theory, how is it that men ever thought of transferring all these marvellous operations to Jesus? For this there must have been some occasion, and if there was a substratum of historical fact, its embellishment was possible without reference to any Greek prototypes.

The narrative regarding the woman of Samaria, $4^{1ff.}$, is derived by Weber[6] and van den Bergh van Eysinga[7]—on the grounds that the chapter is incoherent, and that the account of the relation between Jews and Samaritans (v.[9]) exaggerates the facts—from the following story in the *Divyâvadâna*:[8] "*Un jour Ânanda le serviteur de Çâkyamuni, après avoir longtemps parcouru la campagne, rencontre une jeune fille Mâtangi, c'est-à-dire de la tribu des Tchâṇḍâlas, qui puisait de l'eau, et lui demande à boire. Mais la jeune fille craignant de le souiller de son contact, l'avertit, qu'elle est née dans la caste Mâtanga, et qu'il ne lui est pas permis d'approcher un Religieux. Ânanda lui répond alors: 'Je ne te demande, ma soeur; ni ta caste, ni ta famille; je te demande seulement de l'eau, si tu peux m'en donner.'*" Here then the story is told of a disciple of Buddha, not of Buddha himself; of a

[1] *Origine*, iii. 70.

[2] "Mythical and Legendary Elements in the N.T.," *New World*, 1899, 295.

[3] *Christianity and Mythology*, 356 ff. [Germ. trans., *Die Evangelien-Mythen*, 77 ff.].

[4] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 207. [5] *Verständnis*, 71.

[6] "Die Griechen in Indien," *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1890, 928, n. 4; *ibid.* 1897, 605, n. 3.

[7] *Einflüsse*, 57 ff.

[8] Cp. Burnouf, *Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme indien*, i., 1844, 205; also Beal, *Abstract*, 166.

young maiden, not a woman who has had five husbands; besides, the rest of the story is very different from that in the Gospel of John. Thus John's account is certainly not derived from the Buddhist story: the difficulties which it presents are explained partly by the characteristics of this Evangelist's style, partly by his ignorance of Jewish conditions, another instance of which we shall meet on a later page. Further, the comparison of the gospel to living water in v.[10ff.] is not necessarily, *pace* Franke,[1] of Buddhist origin; at any rate it is not of Aryan origin: it is found expressed in similar terms in Is 55[1]. And, to pass at once to a cognate topic, it is still less possible, with Edmunds,[2] to regard the saying of Jn 7[38]: "*He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water*," as a citation from the *Paṭisambhidâ*, 1. 53, a passage which the last-named scholar translates thus: "*What is the Tathâgato's knowledge of the twin miracle? In this case, the Tathâgato works a twin miracle unrivalled by disciples: from his upper body proceeds a flame of fire, and from his lower body proceeds a torrent of water. Again, from his lower body proceeds a flame of fire, and from his upper body a torrent of water.*" The passage in John is to be explained by the use of sculptured human figures as ornamental fountains; and the idea thus suggested has remoulded in the Evangelist's mind[3] some such passage as Is 58[11]: "*He shall make strong thy bones; and thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water, whose waters fail not.*" Or it is to be explained as a quotation from an Apocryphal writing, such as we may find elsewhere in the New Testament.[4] If one may here refer to another point, there are no grounds for supposing that Ânando was (as Edmunds[5] thinks possible) the original of the beloved disciple.

In Jn 8[56ff.] Jesus says that Abraham rejoiced to see His

[1] *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2760, 2764. [2] *Buddhist Texts*, 9 ff.

[3] Cp. H. Holtzmann-W. Bauer, *Handkommentar zum N.T.* iv. 166 f.; Gressmann, *Ursprung*, 24, n. 1.

[4] It is very improbable that the saying ought to be derived from Zec 13[1], as Grill (*Untersuchungen*, i. 16, n. 1, 362) proposes.

[5] *Buddhist Texts*, 27.

day, and the Jews raise the objection, "*Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?*" Whereupon Jesus answers, "*Before Abraham was, I am.*" This does not agree well with the statement in Lk 3^{23} that Jesus began to teach when He was about thirty years of age; and accordingly we might, with Seydel[1] and Franke,[2] derive the saying from Buddhism. For in the *Lotus* (14. 43 ff., *Sacred Books*, xxi. 293 ff.) the Bodhisattva Maitreya expresses doubts similar to those of the Jews. "Buddha had first left his native town somewhat over forty years before: how could he assert that he had enlightened and converted such a multitude of Bodhisattvas, who then in hosts like the sand of countless Ganges-rivers appeared previous to him, and who in times long past lived upon earth? The Master solves the enigma by referring to his former births: he had been Buddha millions of times." The objection that the Lotus is rather a late work, Seydel attempts to remove by pointing out that the Buddhist doctrine of pre-existence is distinctly older than Christianity. But the Buddhist doctrine does not contain this particular idea; and even if it did, it would still have no parallel in Christian teaching: for Christ had no previous human existence. How the doctrine of His pre-existence arose, we have already seen (p. 337); and similarly, the Fourth Evangelist was able, without foreign prototypes, to represent the Jews as urging the foolish objection that Jesus, who declared that He had seen Abraham, was no more than thirty years of age.

In the story of the man who was blind from his birth, the disciples ask (9^2): "*Rabbi, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he should be born blind?*" This saying might imply the belief in the pre-existence of the soul; and since this is not to be found in any other part of the Bible,[3] it

[1] *Evangelium*, 166 f., 297. [2] *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2766.

[3] Nor is it implied in the description of the Baptist as Elias redivivus, to which Hopkins (*India*, 127, n. 1) calls attention. In Curtiss's *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, 127 [Germ. trans. 130]—to which also de Jong appeals (*Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1904, 518 f.)—we are told that some Nosairi Protestants, when they heard the story of the man that was born blind, said, "Either that man sinned in a previous state or his parents must have sinned": and the American scholar would apparently prove thereby the existence of an ancient Semitic belief in the transmigration of souls. But there is great temerity in this.

might be derived from foreign influences. Seydel[1] again thinks of Buddhism, and there of the parable in the *Lotus* (5. 44, *Sacred Books*, xxi. 129 f.), in which it is said of a man born blind (who is then healed): "*The disease of this man originates in his sinful actions in former times.*" But it is, I think, more pertinent to appeal to the Greek idea of pre-existence, which we find in the Book of Wisdom (8^{20}), in Slavonic Enoch (23^5 49^2 58^5), and in Philo (*de Gigant.* 7, ed. Mangey, i. 266 f.), and which we need not further trace to Oriental influences. It is possible, indeed, that the writer of the Fourth Gospel has no thought even of the Greek doctrine, but is once more representing the disciples as asking one of their foolish questions: for he may possibly have rejected even the view that the sins of parents are visited upon their children.

In Jn 11^{51} it is stated that Caiaphas, in uttering the words: "*It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not,*" prophesied, because he was high priest that year. Heitmüller[2] believes that this exceedingly mechanical and external conception of prophetic "inspiration" is perhaps to be derived from foreign influences, and, in fact, one might think of them the more readily as the idea that the high priest changed every year must also be borrowed from non-Jewish conditions. Still, this last point is a different matter; and for the first-mentioned idea other explanations are more natural. It is true that, according to Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 8. 9, the old Urim and Thummim no longer existed in later times: but, according to vi. 6. 3 and Philo, *De Creat. Princ.* 8 (ed. Mangey, ii. 367), the high priest was still regarded as a medium of divine revelation.

When the multitude raise the objection (Jn 12^{34}): "*We have heard out of the law that the Christ abideth for ever,*" Edmunds[3] sees again in this a Buddhist quotation. For in the *Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta* (3. 3, *Sacred Books*, xi. 40) the following words appear, according to Edmunds' translation:

[1] *Evangelium*, 232 f., 297.
[2] In J. Weiss's *Die Schriften*, ii. 3. 270.
[3] *Buddhist Texts*, 13 ff.; cp. *Gospels*, 12 f.

"*Ânando, any one who has practised the four principles of psychical power . . . can, if he should wish, remain on earth for the aeon or the rest of the aeon. Now, Ânando, the Tathâgato has practised and perfected these; and if he so should wish, the Tathâgato could remain on earth for the aeon or the rest of the aeon.*" But even if the Tathâgato could be identified with Christ, still he shares with others the privilege spoken of, and enjoys it only if he so desires, whereas the statement in John is altogether unqualified.[1] And, more than this, the statement does not in any way require to be explained by other religions: for that was the prevailing view among the Jews.[2]

When in Jn 14^{16} the Spirit is called another Advocate, and in v.^{26} 15^{26} 16^{7} *the* Advocate (as Christ also in 1 Jn 2^{1}), these later passages, it is true, are to be understood in the light of the earlier one: still the expression, which after all is remarkable, and which is not satisfactorily explained even by a reference to Philo,[3] might itself be of foreign origin. Zimmern, therefore, as we have already seen (p. 205 f.), would have us think of the deities of intercession in Babylonian religion; but that idea is too general, and, further, one does not see how it should have influenced Christianity directly. The same remark applies to the Persian expectation of Saoshyant (which is, besides, of quite a different nature), and also to the Indian expectation of a later Buddha—both of which are adduced by Seydel.[4] This writer compares also the name of this later Buddha, Maitreya (*i.e.* son or child of friendship, love of one's neighbour, benevolence), with the Holy Spirit in Christianity: but even that is not convincing. Further, the expectation of later Buddhas, taken as a whole, is admittedly not one of the original elements of Buddhism; and even if it were, it would still be a different matter from the doctrine of the Spirit in the Gospel of John. Franke[5] therefore compares the doctrine of the Dhamma, of which

[1] Cp. also de la Vallée-Poussin, *Rev. Bibl.*, 1906, 371.

[2] Cp. the short account in Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii., 1898, 543 [Eng. trans. II. ii. 160 ff.].

[3] Cp. Grill, *Untersuchungen*, i. 133 ff.

[4] *Evangelium*, 263 ff.

[5] *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1901, 2760.

the *Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta* (6. 1, *Sacred Books*, xi. 112) says: "*The truths and the rules of the order which I have set forth and laid down for you all, let them, after I am gone, be the Teacher to you*"—a passage which we may compare with Jn 16^{13}; but this saying does not require any such original. And if a foreign provenance for the *term* παράκλητος is assumed, no detailed proof of such an origin has yet been furnished.[1]

And at present we are still less able to prove such an origin for the idea of the vine (15^{1}), which, however, to judge by the mode of expression in other parts of the Gospel of John, is certainly borrowed. For it is not explained by the occasion on which this discourse is said to have been delivered, nor by the Eucharistic prayer (itself obscure in meaning) in Did. 9^{2}: εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαβὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου.[2] Further, when in the Apocalypse of Baruch 36^{3} 39^{7} the rule of the Messiah is typified by a vine and a spring of water, that is only a supplementary and artificial interpretation of a narrative which originally had another meaning.[3] On the other hand, it is not possible with E.[4] and O. Pfleiderer[5] and with Jeremias,[6] to derive the idea of the vine in Jn 15^{1} from the myth of Dionysus, or, as Jeremias here again says, from the Oriental calendar-myth: for such a myth cannot be shown to have existed in this form, and the myth of Dionysus cannot, I think, have influenced Christianity. But perhaps Jeremias'[7] reference to Herodotus vii. 27 is not inapposite. This passage describes how the Lydian Pythios, the son of Atys, presented to Darius Hystaspes a golden plane tree (that is the meaning of πλατάνιστος) and

[1] Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 242 [Eng. trans. 339 f.], thinks that even the use of the term probably started with Paul, and that the idea grew to full maturity and attained classical formulation in the Johannine writings.

[2] Nor are the explanations satisfactory that are offered by Drews, *Handbuch zu den neutest. Apokryphen*, 1904, 270, and O. Holtzmann, "Das Abendmahl im Urchristentum," *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1904, 109.

[3] Cp. Clemen, "Die Zusammensetzung des Buches Henoch, der Apokalypse des Baruch u. des vierten Buches Esra," *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1898, 231 f.

[4] *Die Philosophie Heraklits*, 1886, 379 f.

[5] *Urchristentum*, ii. 378 [Eng. trans. iv. 64].

[6] *Babylonisches*, 33.

[7] *Das A.T.* 193, n. 3 [Eng. trans. i. 209, n. 3].

a vine; and this vine may, like the one sent to Pompey by Aristobulus II. (Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 3. 1) have had a symbolical meaning. And, above all, such a significance was probably attached to the vine in the temple at Jerusalem:[1] indeed, we may even conjecture the source of the idea. According to the *Bundahiṣ* (14. 1 f., *Sacred Books*, v. 45 f.), there arose from the blood of the primeval ox among other things the vine—as also on the reverse of the Mithraic Bas-relief from Heddernheim (Fig. 12) the sun-god presents a cluster of grapes to Mithras.[2] Still it is not necessary that Mithraism itself should have influenced the circles from which the Gospel of John sprang: one may think of Mandaeism also, or of some tendency resembling it. For in Mandaeism the vine plays a similar part, but cannot, as Brandt[3] maintains, be derived from Christianity. For it appears in the treasure-house of the upper world, and is described as that first chief vine, in other words, it is thought of as in the Bundahiṣ. Accordingly the vine of Jn 15^{1} may possibly also be derived from this or a similar religion: here, as in some other matters, we can reach no certain conclusion.

In reference to one point, however, we can, I think, make a definite though negative assertion. The statement in Jn $19^{23f.}$ regarding the partition of Jesus' garments has certainly arisen from Ps 22^{19}, and is not to be explained (as Seydel[4] explains it) from the quarrel over the relics of Buddha and its ultimate settlement by a Brahman, as told in the *Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta* (6. 51 ff., *Sacred Books*, xi. 131 ff.).[5] And as this is the last case which we have to consider of a supposed influence of Buddhism on the New Testament, we may at the same time recapitulate our conclusions. As one might expect *a priori*, such an influence cannot at any point be demonstrated, even in regard to ordinary details. It is therefore still less justifiable to suppose that any slighter resemblances between primitive

[1] Cp. Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii., 1898, 103, n. 4 [Eng. trans. II. ii. 292 f.].

[2] Cp. Cumont, *Textes*, i. 197, ii., 1896, 365.

[3] *Mand. Rel.* 63, 197; also "Das Schicksal der Seele nach dem Tode nach mand. und pars. Vorstellungen," *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1892, 433 ff.

[4] *Evangelium*, 282, 299; *Buddha-Legende*, 123.

[5] Cp. also Foucaux, *Rgya*, ii. 423 ff.

Christian and Buddhist literature, or even that the arrangement of the narratives in the Gospels, are to be explained in this way. On the other hand, the affinities between them, particularly between the Gospel of John and the Bhagavadgîtâ —and while Lorinser[1] and Nève[2] discover them in far too many passages, Hopkins[3] and even Tiele[4] acknowledge their existence—are probably not due (as Tiele would think) to the Oriental origin of the Johannine writings, but to Christian influences on Indian literature, the operation of which we have already shown to be possible (p. 37 ff.). To refer to the judgment of only one scholar—Oldenberg[5] is justified in his belief "that nothing in the four Gospels points conclusively or with any special plausibility to more than an inner parallelism with Buddhist thought and literature, or to an actual borrowing of ideas from India." So, too, when he adds, "Even if there should really have been Buddhist influence at work in some one or other of the New Testament narratives . . . the discovery would make hardly a hair's breadth of difference to our idea of Christianity itself."

[1] *Die Bhagavad Gita*, 1869, especially v. ff., 267 ff.
[2] *Annales de philos. chrét.*, 1876, 231 ff., 305 ff., 405 ff.
[3] *India*, 152, 155 ff.
[4] *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1877, 75 f.
[5] *Indien u. die Religionswissenschaft*, 1906, 18 ff.; cp. also Falke, *Buddha, Mohammed, Christus*, i., 1896, 110 ff.; Dieterich, *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.*, 1905, 506.

CONCLUSION.

Let us sum up the results at which we have arrived regarding the dependence of primitive Christianity upon non-Jewish religions and philosophical systems. First of all, an indirect or direct influence of these on the preaching of Jesus and the ideas of the Synoptists is discernible merely in certain expressions, metaphors, and comparisons (Mt 5^{48} $7^{13f.\ 16}$, Mk 2^{17} and par., Lk 4^{23}): the subject-matter as a whole is very little affected. On the other hand, the Areopagus discourse in Ac $17^{24ff.}$ is even in its matter partially dependent upon Greek popular philosophy, especially upon Stoicism; and Paul himself is similarly dependent in his corresponding views. In Paul's doctrine of freedom it is, I think, only the expression, not the thought, that is borrowed; but his dictum regarding the equality of the sexes (Gal 3^{28}, Col 3^{11}) is in part derived from foreign, and there again Stoic, influences, all the more probably as Paul has not worked out the full consequences of the principle. Again, the doctrine that the flesh is the source of sin has partially the same origin; so, too, the classification of certain sins in the so-called catalogues of vices—a classification, however, which again is only an affair of externals. Further, the so-called "parties" in the Corinthian Church, and the importance they attached to literary style and profound wisdom, are to be traced to heathen influences. Even Paul himself might be partially indebted to Stoicism in his judgment regarding the "natural" and the "spiritual" man (1 Co $2^{14f.}$); in the comparison of man with the temple of God (3^{16}); in the dictum, "*All things are yours*" (v.^{21}); in the description of himself in $4^{1ff.}$; in his statement and illustration of the principle, "*Let each man abide in that calling wherein he was called*" ($7^{17ff.}$); even in the warning that one should not through his knowledge make his weak brother perish (8^{11}).

There is no doubt that his appeal to nature (11^{14}) comes ultimately from the same source; and the comparison of a society with the body ($12^{12ff.}$, Ro $12^{4ff.}$), as well as the comparison of the body with a vessel or a tent (2 Co 4^{7} 5^{1}), was also a particular favourite with the Stoics. But if in these cases we have only to do with comparisons, Paul's further debts to philosophy in this chapter (2 Co 5) involve the substance of his teaching as well: for he teaches that the body weighs us down and that the soul might be freed from it, even now in visions ($12^{2f.}$). This is at the same time the *clearest* instance of Paul's indebtedness to Greek philosophy: otherwise, I think, it has exercised only a joint and partial influence upon him. Thus, for example, when in Ro 9 he explains the unbelief of Israel deterministically, when he justifies the wrath of God as a means of revealing His glory, and in chap. 11, when he anticipates the ultimate conversion of Israel. Even the vegetarianism that is spoken of in chap. 14 f. might be in some degree of non-Jewish origin; and lastly, Paul himself in Ph 4^{8}, with full consciousness, I believe, includes natural morality in Christian morality.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, the Johannine literature in its doctrine of the Logos, the Epistle to the Ephesians in its belief in a world of ideas, go back to Greek philosophy: otherwise the rest of the post-Pauline writings are influenced by it only in phraseology and in their figurative language.

Among the various conceptions that were common to all Christian teachers and schools, and were also already present in Jewish thought, the description of God as the Highest, and the idea of creation by the Word might be derived collaterally from Gentile influence, and the latter especially from Egyptian influence; but, in particular, the seven archangels, the four and twenty elders, and the four living creatures of the Apocalypse come ultimately from Babylonia. If there was no longer in later times any consciousness of the astronomical origin of these "existences," still the heavenly bodies even in those later times were regarded as animate; and this fact reveals the influence of Parsism as well as of Babylonian religion. Both of these may have left their

traces also in the belief in guardian angels; and the latter particularly, in the belief in daemons and Satan.

Further, in the New Testament teaching relative to the signs of the end, the image of the apocalyptic horsemen ultimately comes from Babylon, while the angel of the abyss, Rev 9^{11}, may partially be traced to Apollo, and the armies of horsemen, v.$^{16ff.}$, may have been taken from some foreign source. In all probability the beasts of the Apocalypse are derived from Babylonia, though probably by way of Persia; also the expectation of a last appearance of Satan comes, I think, from Mazdeism. On the other hand, one can hardly suppose a foreign derivation for the belief that there would be *two* forerunners of the Messiah; but I think the three and a half days after which the two witnesses are to rise from the dead (Rev $11^{9.\ 11}$), like the similar number in v.$^{2f.}$ and 13^{5}, have their source in mythology. The idea of the Son of Man comes ultimately from Parsism, and the speculation in this system regarding the Primal Man probably lurks behind such passages as 1 Co $15^{45ff.}$ and Ph $2^{6f.}$. But, more important than this, the expectation of a future triumph over the devil, of a universal conflagration, of a new heaven and a new earth, as well as of the destiny of the blessed, agrees so fully with Mazdeism even in details, that here again the influence of this system must be admitted. And so, too, the Mazdean belief, that the soul traverses a series of heavens, has probably influenced 2 Co $12^{2ff.}$, perhaps also He 4^{14}, 1 Ti 3^{16}, and particularly Jude ^{9} —just as the Mazdean comparison of the resurrection body with a new heavenly garment has influenced the corresponding passages in Paul's Epistles (2 Co $5^{1ff.}$) and the Apocalypse.

As for ethical ideas, one of them, which was, of course, so conspicuously assailed in the New Testament, viz. the emphasis laid on ceremonial precepts and ceremonial righteousness, which were ranked as even more important than the requirements of the cult, is probably to be traced in some measure to Parsism: so, too, the comparison employed in the New Testament itself, of righteousness with light and of sin with darkness. Likewise the idea presupposed in Ro 3^{23}

that man has through the Fall come short of the glory of God, is derived from Mazdeism.

Among the *new* ideas which were common to all Christian teachers and schools, the belief in the exaltation of Jesus may possibly, in Gentile-Christian communities, have been reinforced here and there by conceptions of apotheosis; but in its essence the Christian belief was of a different nature, and had no need of such assistance. Also, the triadic expression in which God or the Father, Jesus Christ or the Son, and the Holy Spirit are named together, is to be traced to pagan influences only in so far as, like other combinations, it is grounded upon the widespread partiality for the number three.

To pass to the institutions of primitive Christianity, divine worship might be supposed in some measure to have come by way of the synagogue from Persia: still this theory cannot be shown to be really possible or necessary. Further, only the name for meetings of the congregation, *συναγωγή*, and in Gentile-Christian communities the name for the officers of the Church, *πρεσβύτεροι*, are derived—and only partially derived—from the terminology usual in Greek associations for worship. Glossolalia and the "enthusiasm" of primitive Christianity in general have at the most their basis in pagan religions only in so far as individual Christians might there have formed the habit of falling into ecstasies and then expressing themselves in the manner described. Again, the equalization of men and women, masters and slaves, may partly have been dependent upon corresponding usages in the associations for worship: for the rest, the influence of Greek and other religions is here again confined to terminology.

The custom of having oneself baptized for the dead, which Paul himself did not necessarily approve, but which he only supposed to be observed among the Corinthians or certain Corinthians, was derived from pagan religions; and perhaps also the high estimate of baptism which appears in the writings of the Fourth Evangelist, not as his own belief, but as prevalent in the circles which he addressed. On the other hand, when we come to the Acts of the Apostles, the

importance there attached to baptism as a means of securing the forgiveness of sins, is based only generally on the pagan belief in purifications; and similarly the belief that there is a magical virtue in the name (such as we find in the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles as well as in the Apocalypse) must have partially the same origin.

The debasement of the Lord's Supper alluded to in 1 Co $11^{20f.}$ may possibly have been due to pagan influence; similarly the peculiar importance which, as Jn 6 shows, was attached to it in some circles. Apart from this, however, it is only certain expressions employed in this connexion by Paul that are to be traced to the pagan idea of a union with the deity: the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament is independent of these influences.

Among the stories of the childhood of Jesus, the narrative of the star which guided the Magi goes back ultimately to Babylonian ideas, and probably also the account of the persecution of the infant Jesus by Herod—a feature which certainly comes from pagan mythology. Then, in the story of Jesus' baptism, the use of the dove to symbolize the Spirit may originally have been borrowed from the same source: it would, however, be a symbol and nothing more. The term ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, which occurs so frequently in the Synoptists as a name for God, might be partly derived from Babylonian and Persian influences: on the other hand, the comparison of Jesus with a bridegroom may perhaps (and only in the Apocalypse) be traced to a myth regarding the marriage of the victorious god—in the other passages we have to do with comparisons that have clearly a different basis. The divine hypostasis of Wisdom is, I think, partly derived from foreign influences, most probably from Parsism: for the rest, in the Synoptists it is only the account of an eclipse of the sun and an earthquake at the time of the crucifixion that goes back to non-Jewish ideas—as also the statement in Ac 4^{31}, "*When they had prayed, the place was shaken wherein they were gathered together.*"

When Paul and others described Jesus and the angels as Lords and Gods, they were in their mode of expression dependent on the current use of these ideas. The supposition

that a pre-existent being had become man, may possibly have been made easier for Paul by a theory of which I think we have traces in 1 Co $2^{7ff.}$, for others also by the belief not merely in transient manifestations, but in permanent incarnations of the Deity. When in 2 Th 2^{8}, and (in another sense) in the Pastoral Epistles, the appearance of the Saviour is spoken of, it is again only the mode of expression that is borrowed: on the other hand, in Gal 4^{14}, if the term *ἐκπτύειν* is to be understood literally, it is only among the pagans of Galatia that the superstitious belief in the prophylactic uses of spitting is assumed to exist. But in 1 Co 5^{5} even Paul himself is influenced by the heathen idea of the efficacy of the curse, and in the threefold division of the world (Ph 2^{10}), which is also to be found in Rev 5^{3}, he is ultimately indebted to the Babylonians.

In post-Pauline writings the term *φωτίζειν*, which we meet in He 10^{32}, Eph 1^{18} 3^{9}, 2 Ti 1^{10}, can be traced to the Mysteries; and the description of Jesus as the Shepherd in He 13^{20}, 1 P 2^{25} 5^{4}, Jn $10^{11.\ 14}$, as well as the term "fulness of God" in Jn 1^{16}, to the Hermetic literature: still in all these cases it is only the mode of expression that is so derived. There is a reminiscence of a pagan idea in the verse that speaks of "the seal of the firm foundation of God" (2 Ti 2^{19}); and in *θεόπνευστος* (3^{16}) a pagan conception has actually penetrated into Christian thought: but the Gnostic ideas derived from non-Jewish beliefs are rejected in the Epistle to Titus and the First Epistle to Timothy. Elsewhere in these Epistles as well as in the Epistle of James and the Second Epistle of Peter there is nothing borrowed from such sources except terms or modes of expression.

The influence of the Hermetic literature on the Johannine is also limited in the same way: for the rest, the expression *παράκλητος* may perhaps be, and the figure of the vine in Jn 15^{1} is probably, of foreign origin: but a definite provenance for this last idea cannot be ascertained. And even if future research should be more successful, it would only be one *expression* and one *figure* more that would be derived from non-Jewish religions.

If, then, we leave such external matters definitely on one

side, the New Testament *ideas* that are *perhaps* derived from non-Jewish sources—for we may emphasize once more the hypothetical nature of most of our results—lie mainly on the fringe of Christianity, and do not touch its vital essence. For that may be said, I think, even of the belief in the devil and the eschatological ideas that were in some measure at least taken from Parsism—and it may be said much more positively of the others. But at the same time the knowledge of the foreign origin of these ideas would really have a liberating effect: if we cannot hold them any longer in this form, we may now all the more readily abandon them. On the other hand, it would not disturb our Christian belief if several other New Testament conceptions to which we adhere, had been shown to be borrowed: but this is precisely what is *not* the case, however frequently and confidently it has been asserted.

In view of the relative novelty of these inquiries, one can well understand how, when men's minds were first impressed by the resemblances between Christian and non-Christian ideas, such confident assertions should be believed. And seeing that for whole decades so little had been done in Germany to popularize even the best-established results of theological science, it was natural that as soon as an endeavour was made to repair this omission, the pettiest and most doubtful discoveries should be at once proclaimed upon the housetops. Finally, we recall with admiration and gratitude the service rendered by the older investigators who engaged in these new lines of inquiry: only, they would have acted more wisely if they had not staked their authority in support of uncertain hypotheses, but had rather availed themselves of their well-deserved reputation, far oftener than has hitherto been done, to caution their fellow-men against the abuse of the new method.

If the religious-historical interpretation of the New Testament does not guard against such excesses much more carefully than it is often inclined to do, I am afraid that future research will leave its well-established results on one side, just as our own age for a time forgot almost entirely the results attained by earlier scholars. On the other hand,

if it adheres strictly to the methodological principles laid down in an early part of this work (p. 16 ff.), its discoveries will be recognized even by those who in the first instance still reject them; and these discoveries will, like so many others, gradually win their own way to acceptance, unaided by hasty popularization, and not permanently impeded by official repression. In this region of inquiry also the truth will ultimately prevail.

INDEXES.

Important headings, summaries, or discussions are indicated by printing the numbers of the pages in **bold-face type.**

I. GENERAL INDEX.

Abaddon-Apollyon, 127.
Abba Gorion, 309.
Abhinishkramaṇa-Sûtra, 36, 302, 311, 313, 318.
Aboda Zara, 309.
"Abomination of desolation," 127 f., 132.
Abraham, 80, 272, 283, 298, 302, 359; A.'s bosom, 170, 172.
Abubekr, 357.
Academics, 73.
Achaemenids, 25, 27, 30.
Açoka. *See* "Asoka."
Acta Thomae, 241.
Adam, 158; Fall of, 70, 179; the first and the last, 152, 290; perhaps = Adapa, 154.
Adapa, myth of, 153 f., 180.
Adonis, 30, 149, 150, 183, 188, 196, 308.
Advocate, 362.
Aelian, 292.
Aeneas of Gaza, 170.
Aeons, 350 f.
Aêshma Daêva, 112.
Agrippa, 186.
Agumkakrime, 131.
Agur, 175 f.
Ahaz, 143.
Ahikar, 112, 330.
Ahriman. *See* "Angra Mainyu."
Ahuna Vairya, 11.
Ahura Mazda, 24, 25, 26, 80, 81, 91, 96, 111, 115, 142, 160, 173, 174, 207, 261; and the Amesha Spentas, 92.
Airyama-ishyô, 96.
Akiravatî, 325.
Alexander the Great, 28, 29; legend of, 282.
Alexander Polyhistor, 35.
Alexandria, 30, 186, 203, 297.
Alexandrian interpretation, 218.
Alexandrianism, 14.
Alitta (or Alilat), 26.
Allegorization (Philo's), 297.
Alphaeus, 102.
Alpu = Taurus, 102.
Amarna. *See* "Tell el Amarna."
Ambapâli, 329.
Amenophis III., 20.
Amenophis IV., 20, 79.
Ameretât, 27.
Amesha Spentas, 27, 91, 94, 96, 111, 116, 166; number of, 92, cp. 96.
Ammon, 30.
Anâhita, 25, 26, 27, 96.
Ânanda (or Ânando), 358 f., 362.
Andrew, 282, 356.
Andros, 358.
Angelology, Jewish, 5, 11, 339; Pauline, 10; Persian, 11.
Angelophanies, 190.
Angels, 83; the whole belief not Babylonian, 111; of the little ones, of Peter, etc., 110; of the elements, 110; guardian angels, 93 f., 368.
Angra Mainyu, 25, 26, 80, 115, 127, 142, 160, 173, 262.
Aṅguttara-Nikâya, 164.
Animal stories, 19, 35.
Animate nature of heavenly bodies, **106 ff.**, 367.
Anna, 55, 273, 312.
Antares, 100.

Antichrist, 305; legend, 123, 137.
Antigonus, 186.
Antioch, Church at, 196, 216.
Antiochus II. of Bactria, 35.
Antiochus I. of Commagene, 351.
Antipas, 278.
Antony, 186.
Anu, 141, 285.
Aphrodite, 30.
Apocalypse, 4; designations of Jesus in, 88, 94, 105; Messianic reign of 1000 years, 161.
Figures, symbols, etc.:—
angel of the abyss, 127, 368.
angels (seven), 85, 91, 367.
beast, 128 ff.
book with seven seals, 124.
bowls of wrath, 117, 127.
candlesticks, two, 140.
candlesticks, seven, etc., 85.
creatures, four living, **97 ff.**, 367.
crown of life, 174.
dragon, 128 ff., 136 f., **303 f.**
eagle, 98 f., 304.
elders, four and twenty, 95, 367.
eyes of the Lamb, seven, 83, 85, 86, 105.
frogs, 127.
horns of the Lamb, seven, 105.
horns of the beast, ten, 132.
horsemen, 14, 117, 125, 368.
Jerusalem, new or heavenly, 102, 165, 320; its foundations, 101; its twelve gates, 101; its wall, 167.
kings, seven, 125.
lake of fire, 161, 162 f.
Lamb, 104.
lamps, seven, 83, 85.
locusts, 127.
morning star, 94.
olive trees, two, 140.
palms, 174.
plagues, seven, 124 f.
prophet, false, 128.
river (=Milky Way), 102, 167.
sea of glass, 97.
seals, seven, 89, 91, 117.
spirits, seven, 83, 85, 87.
stars, twelve, 101.
stones, precious, 101.
thunders, seven, 118.
trumpets, seven, 89, **90**, 117, 126.
wine of wrath of God, 237.
witnesses, two, 117, 128, 140.
woes, 126.
woman on beast, 130, 134.
woman and the dragon, 130, **303 ff.**
Apocryphal writing, 359.
Apollo, 127, 146, 303.
Apophis, 133.
Apostolic Canons, 206.
Apostolic Constitutions, 206.
Apotheosis, 202 f., 369; of kings, 348.
Apsû, 82.
Apuleius, 230.
Aquarius, 98.
Aquila (constellation), 98 f.; (man), 292.
Arabah, 165.
Arabia, 176.
Arabian monuments, 101; (North-) cult, 293, 356.
Arabians, 26, 113, 133.
Arabs, Mawali, 311.
Aradus, 30.
Aram, 143.
Aramaean, 264.
Aramaic, 53, 206.
Aratus, 59.
Arcadia, 34.
Archangels, 84, 86, 92; names, etc., 92 f., cp. 339.
Archons, 87.
Areimanios, 26.
Arhat, 331.
Aries, 99, 105.
Aristides, 106, 155.
Aristobulus II., 364.
Aristotle, 26, 203.
Armenia Minor, 31.
Armenian practice, etc., 300 f.
Artapanus, 202.
Artaxerxes Mnemon, 25.
Arû, 97 f.
Aruru, 268, 272.
Asceticism, 49, 73.
Asha Vahista, 94.
Asia Minor, 230, 310.
Asita, 312.
Asmodaeus, 112.
Asoka, 35, **36**, 207.
Associations for worship, 209–212, 245, 369.
Assurbanipal, 87, 109, 149.
Assyrian, 20, 22, 26, 344; the A. (in Isaiah), 139; Juno, 101; riddles and proverbs, 177; stele of the vultures, 166.
Assyro-Babylonian, 5; kings, 292; religion, **22 ff.** *See* also "Babylonia, Babylonian."
Astral, astrological, astronomical, 84 ff., 90, 97, 107, 110, **132**, 319.
Aṣû, 191.
Aśvaghosha, 36.
Atarachasis, 269.
Atargatis, 251.
Athens, 30; Paul in, 58, cp. 366.
Atonement, 14, 231, 258 f., 341; Great Day of, 63.

Attis, 1 f., 105, 149, 155, 183, 188, 194, 262, 346.
Auctor ad Theophilum, 226.
Augustine, 1 f., 58, 262.
Augustus, 29, 301, 310; his temple at Caesarea Philippi, 310.
Aurelius, Marcus, 45.
Avadânas, 37.
Avalokitesvara, 200.
Avesta, 3, 11, 25, **26 ff.**, 178.
Avîchi, 200.
Âyadanâs, 25.
Azarias, 272.
Azi Dahâka, 123, 133, 160.

Baal, **31.**
Ba'al-shamîn, 319.
Babel, 145; B.-Borsippa, 24.
Babel-Bible controversy, 6, 10, **78.**
Babylon, excavations at, 131; ten early kings of, 132; execratory formulae from, 121.
Babylonia, Babylonian, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 20, **78 f.**, 82, 86, 89, 90, 91, 93, 96, 97, 98, 103, 105, 110, 111, 112, 125, 126, 133, 139, 141, 142, 163, 164, 167, 177, 206, 207, 237, 264, 298, 304, 305, 314, 319, 334, 338, 344, 367 f.; religion, **86 f.**, 94, 109, 114, 199, 351; planets, 84; worship of planets, 92, 94; astronomy, 95; deities of light, 148, 199; sun-god, 323 f.; belief in resurrection, etc., **169**, cp. 188, **190 f.**; consciousness of sin, 181; penitential psalms, 179; no parallel to Fall-story, 181; creation-myth, 82, 131, 180; account of Deluge, 122, 275, 276; myth of Adapa, 153 f., 180; "bread of life and water of life," 6, 167, 264; Sacaea, 183, 186, 190; texts, 113; medicine, 328; triads, 205; rites of cleansing, 229; conflict of god with monster, **131**; court style, 145, 146; "sacred tree," 99.
Bacchantes, 134, 257.
Bahman Yast, 28, 123, 139.
Balder, 149.
Baptism, **212 ff.**; Mandaean, 207, 264; magical effect of, 218, 223; for the dead, 219, 369; and forgiveness of sins, 231, 370; prayer at, 225; triple immersion at, 208.
Baptismal command, 204, 206, 214; confession of faith, **222**; formula in Matthew, 208.
Baptist sects (Samaritan), 213.
Bar-Jesus, 343.
Barnabas, 340.
Basilius the Great, 26.
Bathsheba, 288.
Bawri or Bawli, 133.
Bear, Little. *See* "Ursa Minor."
Beast. *See* "Apocalypse," "Monster. "Beginning of travail," 124.
Bel, 11, 23, 24, 132, 152, 276, 279, 283.
Belial, 114.
Beliar, 137.
Belili, 114.
Bendis, 30, 31.
Beresh. Rab., 93, 199.
Berosus, 23, 93, 132, 163, 282, 284.
Bethany, 283 f.
Bethlehem, 293, 298, 305, 308.
Bethsaida, 275.
Bhabra, 36.
Bhagavadgîtâ, 365.
Bharaut, 295.
Bhikkhus, 323.
Bias, 76.
Bimbisâra, 302.
Birth, new, 355. *See* also "Conversion."
Blood-symbolism, 262 f.
Bodhisattva, 298, 315; Maitreya, 360; Sumedha, 331.
Body, Church (or society) compared with, 67, 212, 367; compared with vessel or tent, 68, 367; burden of, 68; separation from, 69, 171 f.; of Christ, 246, 248, 253 f.
Book of the Dead, 97; b. of life, 84.
Bosnia, 260, 265.
Boundahish. *See* "Bundahis."
Brahmâ, 4, 165.
Brahmans, 35, 38.
Brother, the name of, 212, 233.
Buddha, 37, 165, 207, 273, 296, 302, 311, 312, 313, 318, 319, 320, 327, 328, 329, 334, 357; birth of, 295; his visit to temple, 311, 313, 315; heavenly essence of, 157; his visit to hell, 200; relics of, 364; a later, 362; Dîpaṅkara, 331.
Buddha-*karita*-Kâvya, 36, 37, 311, 312, 322.
Buddhava*ṁ*sa, 36, 331.
Buddhism, Buddhist, 5, **6 f.**, 8 f., 16, **34 ff.**, 309, 313, 315, 317, 322, 323, 330–335, 357, 359, 360, 361 f.; influence or dependence upon Christianity, **34 ff.**, 302, 313, 325, **364 f.**
Bundahis, 28, 87, 98, 100, 105, 133, 137, 139, 141, 154, 157, 160, 161, 162, 167, 174, 261, 262, 364.
Bundair, 184.
Byrath, 36.

Caesar, Julius, death of, 333.
Caesar-worship. *See* "Emperor-worship."
Caesarea Philippi, 310.
Caiaphas, 361.
Calendar, Cappadocian, 27; Jewish, 194; C.-myth, 363.
Cambyses, 24 f.
Canaan, 20, **21 f.**
Candlestick, seven-branched, 85 ff.
Canon of sacred scriptures, 77.
Capernaum, 275.
Cappadocia, 26, 31, 194; cp. 27.
Carabas, 186.
Cautes, Cautopates, 207.
Cebes, 51.
Celibacy. *See* "Marriage."
Celsus, 1, 210.
Ceremonial law in Parsism, 178.
Ceremonies, 212.
Chabiri, 20.
"Chaldaeans," 3; (=Persians), 155.
Chaldaeo-Persian, 5.
Chaos, 116; monster of, **129 ff.**
Chariot of Jahweh, of Zeus, etc., 100 f.
China, 38.
Chinese, 132; catalogues of Buddhist literature, 36, cp. 331.
Chorazin, 275.
Christ, Person of, **182 ff.**; Person and Work of (according to Paul), **336 ff.**; blood of, 263; body of, 246, 248, 253 f.; "death, burial, and resurrection" of, 222, 232; "putting on," 61, 216 f., 232, cp. 260 f.; "drinking of," 218.
Christ-myth, 6, 15; cp. "Drews" in Index of Names.
Christian and Mithraic art, 308 f.
Christophanies, 195, 214, 283, 333.
Chrysippus, 211.
Chrysostom, 38.
Church, compared with body, 67, 212, 367; and body of Christ, 246, 248; as πλήρωμα κτλ., 348; organization, 211.
Churches, the seven, 87; Pauline, 210; Gentile-Christian, 210.
Cicero, 203, 258.
Cilicia, 31, 32.
Circumcision, 223.
Classical literature and the N.T., 41 ff.
Cleansings, Essenic, 213; Jewish, 212 f.; belief in sacramental, **229 ff.**
Cleanthes, 59.
Clemens Romanus (1 Clem. 55. 1), 341.
Clementine Homilies, Literature, etc., 45, 156, 241, 251.
Colotes, 172.
Colours, 89, 125 f., 127, 134.
Commagene, 31.
Commodian, 154.
Commodus, 230.
Communio, 247.
Communion with Christ, and baptism, 251 f.
Compromise, Paul and, 67.
Conflagration, universal, 162, 163, 368.
Confraternities, 247.
Conversion, 213, 223. *See* also "Birth, new."
Corinthian, parties, 64 f., 366; C.ns' estimate of baptism, 219, 225, 369; view in regard to Lord's Supper, to daemons, etc., 249, 259, 265, 370.
Cornelius, 210.
Cotta, 258.
Cotys, 30.
Court style of address, 145–147.
Covenant, 238, 244, 258 f.
Crates, 66.
Creation, 10, 60, 116; by the word of God, 82, 367; Philo and the twofold account of the, 153.
Criobolia, 105, 263.
Croesus, 49.
Cronius, 172.
Cumae, 34.
Cuneiform inscriptions, 23.
Curse, operation of, 343, 370.
Curtius Rufus, Q., 31.
Cybele, 1, 30, 31, 134, 263.
Cynics, 49, 52, 65.
Cyprian, 20.
Cyril, 206.
Cyrus, 23, **24**, 49, 301, 308.

Daemonic accusers, 114; frogs, 127; locusts, 127; powers, 126.
Daemonology, Jewish, 5.
Daemons, **111 ff.**, 172, 234, **248 f.**, 254, 258, 259, 265, 326; good (of individuals), 111; Greek belief in, 113; man the dwelling-place of the daemon or daemons, 112 f.
Daêvas, 113.
Damascius, 82.
Dâmdâd Nask, 28.
Damkina, 304.
Darius, 25; Hystaspes, 363.
Darun, 264.
David, 151.
Day of Jahweh, 138, 140; of the Lord, 165.
Deborah, 136.
Decani, 103.

Deism, 2.
Delos, 30.
Deluge, 122, 275 ; belief in, 163, 164 ; D.-mount, episode of, 279 ; D.-towns of Jesus, 275.
Derekh Erez, 141.
Devil. *See* "Daemon" and "Satan."
Dhamma, 318, 362 f.
Dhammapada, 36.
Diadochi, 30.
Diana, 88, 257.
Diaspora, 178, 213.
"Diatribe," 41.
Dînkard, 28, 123.
Dio Cassius, 299.
Dio Chrysostom, 30, 52, 100.
Diodorus Siculus, 23, 87, 95, 103.
Diogenes the Cynic, 52, 231, 338.
Diogenes Laertius, 26, 170, 338.
Dionysiac. *See* "Mysteries."
Dionysus, 30, 183, 258, 358, 363.
Discourse-document, 42, 51, 209, 316.
Divyâvadâna, 37, 358.
Domitian, 130.
Dositheus, 341.
Dove, 206, 316, 370.
Dragon, 133. *See* also "Apocalypse."
Drama (Mystery-), 9 ; dramatic character of story of the Passion, 186.
Dualism, 26, 115, 159, 179 ; anthropological, 62, 71, 73.
Dusares, 293, 356.

Ea, 205, 206, 276, 283.
Eabani, 268 ff., 271 ff., 283.
Easter, date of, 194.
Ecliptic, 99.
Economic conditions, Christianity explained by, 12.
Ecstasy, 171 f., 210, 350, 369.
Eden, Garden of, 168, 180.
Egypt, Egyptian, 3, 5, 12, 15, 20, 30, 31, 85, 99, 131, 148, 207, 230, 237, 293 ; (Rahab), 129 ; and Wisdom literature, 176 ; plagues of, 120 f., 127 ; flight of Jesus' parents to, 306.
Egyptian religion, 14, **22**, 33, 82, 163 ; E. ethics the source of all systems of morality (?), 176 ; E. myth, 132 ; underworld, 169 ; monuments, 101 ; court style, 145.
Egypto-Greek mysticism, 208.
El, 145.
Elders, 209 f. ; in the Apocalpyse, 95 f., 367.
Eleazar, 202, 272.
"Elements," 106, 109.
Eleusinian. *See* "Mysteries."
Elias, Elijah, 140, 271 ff., 309, 328.
Eliphaz, 153.
Elis, 358.
Elisabeth, 290, 296.
Elisha, 272, 324.
Elk-clan of Indians, 251.
Elohim, sons of, 112.
Emmaus, 333.
Emperor-worship, 15, 29, 128, 237, cp. 348 ; E. designated as son of God, 204 ; as "the lord," 337 ; E.'s day, 197.
End of the world, **117 ff.**
Ênitu, 293.
Ennius, 203.
Ephesus, 88.
Ephraim, 143.
Epictetus, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69 f., 71, 211.
Epicureans, 45, 60.
Epicurus, 60, 66, 203.
Epidauria, 187.
Epiphanius, 292, 293, 307, 356.
Equinox, 88 ; vernal, 188, 194 ; precession of the equinoxes, 132.
Er, an Armenian, 172.
Erech, 268, 272, 274, 284.
Eridu cult, 229.
Eros, 67.
Êsagila, 131.
Eschatological drama, two acts of, 160, 168 ; e. theory in the prophets, etc., **119 f.**
Eschatology, cosmological, 138 ; Jewish and Persian, 10, 174 ; Jewish, 13—was it pre-prophetic ? 162 ; Pauline e., 10 ; intermediate state, 168 ; connexions between primal and closing age, 133, 137, 147, 154. *See* also "End of the world."
Essenes, Essenism, 4, 44 f., 55, 193, 213, 256.
Etana-myth, 180, 304.
Eudoxus, 26.
Euphrates the Stoic, 48.
Euripides, 29.
Eusebius of Caesarea, 93, 202, 256, 282, 284, 299.
Eusebius the philosopher, 44.
Ev. de Nativ. Mariae, 290.
Exorcism, **233 ff.**

Fall, the, of Adam, etc., 70, 114, 179, **180 ff.**
Fatalism, 110.
Fihrist, 133.
Filastrius, 307.
Final assault of the hostile powers, **127 ff.**

Fire, **161 ff.**, 207, 314; penal, 163; and the Spirit, 205, 314; appearance of the Godhead in, 138, 314.
Firmicus Maternus, 88, 105, 149, 230.
Flamen Dialis, 29.
Flood. *See* "Deluge."
Folk-lore, 19.
Fomalhaut, 100.
Forerunners. *See* "Messiah."
Formula, compulsive power of, 228 f., 254.
Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king, 311, 312, 321.
Foundation-stone, inscription on, 350, **371.**
Fratres arvales, 29.
Fravard*i*n Yast, 111.
Fravashis, 27, 94, 111, 154.
Friendship, 64.

Gabriel Alexandrinus patriarcha, 239.
Gabriel the archangel, 93, 151.
*G*aina Sûtras, 37, 332.
Games, competitor in, 67.
*G*âtakas, 37, 164, 313, 324, 325.
Gâthas, 28, 111, 113, 123, 163, 166, 173.
Gaumâta, 25.
Gâyômar*d*, 154, 155.
Gemini, 102.
Genealogies, 350 f.
Genii, 101; funerary, 99.
Gerasa, Gerasenes, 236, 275.
Ghost, Holy. *See* "Spirit, Holy."
Gibil, 205, 206.
Gideon, 272.
Gilgamesh, Epic of, 13, 169, **267 ff.**
Gilgamos, 293.
Ginzâ, 133, 193.
Girru, 205.
Glossolalia, **210 f.**, 335, 369.
Gnostics, 12, 34, 36, 87, 107, 156, 199, 206 f., 315, 320, 326, 340, 350 f., 353, 356.
Gnostic-Christian, 155; G.-C. sects, 241.
Gobryas, 172.
God, **77**; and Mammon, 49; as model for imitation, 47; designations of, 80 ff., cp. 344, 351; doctrine of, **45 f.**, 48, 59; eyes of, 85; image of, 338; word of, 82; wrath of, 71; His love for sinners, 46.
Gog, 128, **134 ff.**
Gôźîhar, 139, 162.
Golden age, **146 f.**
Graeco-Roman philosophy, 6, 42, 57.
Greece, Greek, Greek literature and philosophy, 1, 3, 4, 12, 14, 15, 24, 26, **32 f.**, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 69, 75, 109, 111, 171, 230, 231, 296, 337, 367; *see* also "Paul"; G. and India, 35; G. belief in daemons, 113; heroes, 199, 203; idea of God, 46; idea of pre-existence, 361; idea of universal conflagration, 164; poets quoted in N.T., 50; prototypes of Trinity, 207; religion, **28 f.**, 199; underworld, 169; usages of worship, 174.
Guardian angels, divinities, etc., 93 f., 111, 368.

Hadadrimmon, 150.
Hades, keys of, 326; (= Areimanios), 26.
Hadhayâs, 166.
Han dynasty, 37.
Haoma, 96, 166, 262.
Har-Magedon, 127.
Hasmonaeans, 186.
Hathor, 304.
Heathenism, Jews' opinion of, 106 f.
Heaven, new, and new earth, 165, 368; heavens, various, 171 f.
Hebrews, Gospel according to the, 314, 315.
Heddernheim, 182, 364, cp. 262.
Helen, 341.
Hellenic, Hellenism. *See* "Greece, Greek."
Hellenism, Roman. *See* "Roman."
Heraclitus, 2, **50 f.**, 74; (Pseudo-), 65.
Hercules, Heracles, 183, 257.
Hermas, 33 f.
Hermeias, 203.
Hermes, the god, 34, 341.
Hermes Trismegistus. *See* "Hermetic literature."
Hermetic literature, **33 f.**, 72, 156, 337, 338, 347, 348, 353, **371.** Cp. also "Poimandres."
Herod, 301, 305, 306.
Herodotus, 23, 26, 37, 109, 155, 170, 363.
Hibil-Zîvâ, 133, 199.
Hinduism, 340; perhaps dependent upon Christianity, 340.
Hindus, 38.
Hinnom, Valley of, 163.
Hippolytus, 53, 155, 157, 344.
Homer, 203.
Horomazes. *See* "Ahura Mazda."
Horus, 133, 304, 354.
Host of heaven, 106.
Human sacrifices, 9, 185 f., cp. 341.
Humbaba, 269, 274, 276 f., 278, **284 f.**
Hystaspes, Apocalypse of, 123.

Iamblichus, 24.
Idols, attack upon, 58.
Idumaea, 175.
Immanuel, 143.
Immortality, 69, 170, 231, cp. 168.
India, Indians, etc., 4, 5, 9, **34 ff.**, 82, 132, 157, 164; Virgin Birth not derived from, **294 f.**; Christians in, 38; I. and Christian legend, a common source of, 295; I. translation of N.T., 38. *See* further "Buddhism," "Hinduism," "Krishnaism."
Individualism, 168.
Indo-Greek folk-lore, 19.
Indo-Iranian religion, 147.
Inscribing god or angel, 84, cp. 8.
Inspiration, 350, 361, 371.
Intensification of evil and sin, 117 ff.
Intercessor, 205 f.
Intermediary beings, **83 ff.**, 338.
Ira, 276; myth, 122.
Iran, Iranian. *See* "Persia," "Mazdeism."
Isaac, 295, 296.
Ishmael, 296.
Ishtar, 20, 89, 90, 101, 109, 146, 206 f., 269, 277, 285, 293, 314, 316, 320, 323; the virgin, **292.**
Ishullanu, 269, 277, 278.
Isis, 30, 32, 230, 304, 305, 324.
Israel, its sojourn in wilderness, 20.
Italy, 31; Lower, 347.

Jacob, 145; descendants of, 104.
Jahweh, 24, 80, 81, 114, 307; -Jahu, 78; day of, 138, 140; ascent of, into heaven, 148; Servant of, **148 f.**; volcano-god, 138, 161, 162.
Jahwism, 23.
Jalkut Rubeni, 302.
Janus, 326, 327.
Jatakas. *See* "Gâtakas."
Jerome, 293 f., 307.
Jerusalem, reduction of, by Pompey, 129; coming destruction of, 147; new or heavenly Jerusalem, *see* "Apocalypse."
Jerus. Berakhôth, 305.
Jer. Rosh Hash., 93.
Jerus. Targum, 129.
Jesus, birth of, 15, **308 ff.**; star at birth of, 298 f., 370; stories of infancy and childhood, **287 ff.**, 370; presentation in the temple, **310 ff.**; in Egypt, 306; (the boy) in the temple, 312 ff.; baptism and temptation, 273 f., **314 ff.**, 370; public ministry, **318 ff.**; duration of public activity, 184, 186; transfiguration, 140, 279 f., 296, 327 f.; announcement of His passion and resurrection, 54, 327; time of death and date of resurrection, **188 ff.**; mocking of, 187; passion and resurrection, **333 ff.**, cp. 187; darkness and earthquake at crucifixion, 189, 333, 370; partition of garments, 364; historicity of crucifixion, **182 ff.**; basis of tradition of death and resurrection, **194 ff.**; descent into Hades, **198 ff.**; exaltation of, 148, 172, 201, 336 f., 369; creator and preserver of the world, 339; parousia, 140.
Miracles:—
Feeding the multitude, 278, 324; at marriage at Cana, 358, cp. 278; healing "moon-struck" boy, 328.
Parables:—
Lost Sheep, 46; Lost Piece of Silver, 46; Prodigal Son, 46, 330; Rich Fool, 49, 330; Sower, 53, 322; Unjust Steward, 56; Evil Servant, 57; Rich Man (Dives), 168, 283; Marriage Feast, 320; Wise Virgins, 320; Talents, 332.
Discourses, etc.:—
Sermon at Capernaum, 275; Sermon on the Mount, 43 ff., 176, 318; discourse on Bread of Life, **253 f.**, 278; eschatological d., 117, 123, 127, 137, 284, 286; farewell d., 284, 286; d. on the Vine, 363 f., 371.
Disciples:—
first d., 356 f.; the twelve, 102 f., 321; the three, 321; the seventy, 103, 234; sending out of the d., 322; reproof to Peter, 327; the beloved d., 282, 359.
Various Incidents:—
interview with Nicodemus, 226; interview with woman of Samaria, **277 f.**, 355, 358; going to Bethany, 284; visit to Mary and Martha, 329; laudation of J., 329 f.; interview with rich young man, 330 f.; "the Widow's Mite," 331; entry into Jerusalem, 186, 331; washing of disciples' feet, 187, 227, 280.

Jesus :—
Various Sayings :—
48 ff., 168, 173, 198, 211, 279, 320, 359 f.
Some Aspects of Teaching :—
doctrine of God, **46**, 49, 50 ; sin and repentance, 43, 179 ; forgiveness of sins, 242, 244.
Various Theories regarding J. :—
1, 5 ; historicity of, 13, 16, **267 ff.** ; pre-Christian J., 336 (cp. 306 f., and "Sunday").
Names of J., etc. :—
names in the Apocalypse, 88, 94, 105 ; "author of salvation," etc., 173 ; Ναζωραῖος, 306 ; "the bridegroom," 320, 370 ; "the Shepherd," **346 f.**, 371 ; "the living stone," 348 ; "mediator," 345.
His Mission :—
His own idea of His vocation, 52, 201 ; did not purpose a mission to the heathen, 214 ; His realization of His Messiahship, 316 ; acknowledges His Messiahship, 310 ; calls Himself Son of Man, 150 f. ; not influenced by pagan ideas in His consciousness of His task, 159.
Various Attributes and Characteristics :—
pre-existence, 337, 371, cp. 360 ; sinlessness, 315 ; omniscience, 354 f. ; parabolic (and figurative) mode of expression, 244, 322.
Various :—
effect of belief in resurrection of J., 201, 215 ; royal lineage of J., 296 ; J. described like Greek philosopher, 57 ; the Lord's Supper, **238 ff.**, 284 ; the name J., 306 ; prayer in name of, 236 ; did not attribute magical effects to His name, 234 ; baptismal command, **214**.
Jesus Barabbas, 185.
Jewish thought, or Judaism, and the oath, 45 ; and the curse, 343 ; and marriage, 56 ; view of death, and of the consequences of Adam's Fall, 70 ; development within, 82, 83, 168, 178, 323, cp. 77 ff., 121 ; glossolalia in, 210.
Jewish times of observance, 61 ; Sabbath and Christian Sunday, 197 ; opinion of heathenism, 107 ; legalism, 175, 178 : cleansings, 212 f. ; theology of Messiah, 292, 340 ; eschatology, 10, 13, 162, 168 ff. ; transcendentalism, 82, 83, 159, 319, 339.
Jeypore, 184.
Jezebel, 88.
Jinns, 113.
Job, 175 f.
Johanan ben Zakkai, 213.
Johannine circle, 356.
Johannine literature, ideas of, **352 ff.** ; its relation to Philo, 74, 321, 353 f., cp. 367 ; "life" and "light" in, 116, 168, **353** ; and baptism, **226 ff.**, 369.
John, Gospel of, its view of the devil, 115 ; its chronology, 273, 277, 278 ; characteristics of its style, 359 ; its relation to Buddhist epic, 9 ; ignorance of Jewish conditions, 359, cp. 361 ; misunderstandings and objections of disciples and others in, 253, 355, 360 ; its discourse with reference to the Lord's Supper, **253 f.**
John the Baptist, 43, 140, 271, 278, 357 ; historicity of, 272, 314 ; baptism of, **212 f.** ; his saying regarding "the mightier," 273, 314 ; as Elias redivivus, 360, cp. 140.
Jonah, 102.
Jonas, 102.
Joppa, 102.
Jordan, 34.
Joseph, husband of Mary, 288 f.
Josephus, 45, 86, 101, 193, 213, 256, 272, 278, 302, 314, 361, 364.
Joshua (various), 109, 114, 136, 140, 185, 273.
Josiah, 21, 23, 135.
Judah, 143.
Judaism. *See* "Jewish thought."
Judaizers, 60.
Judgment, day of, 161, 173.
Juno, Assyrian, 101.
Jupiter (planet), 90, 125 ; (-Marduk), 88.
Justin, 184, 194, 261, 263.

Kandahar, 38.
Kâṇḍâla, 37, 358.
Kandragupta, 35.
Kanishka, 37.
Kappatthika kibbisa, 321.
Kara*ṇḍavyûha*, 36, 200.
Karshipta, 200.
Kasr, 131.
Kassapa, 334.
Keilinschriftl. Bibliothek, 109.
Kettu, 323.
Keys of Peter, 13, **326 f.**
Khonds, 183.
Khshathra-Vairya, 152, 166.

Kiddûshîn, 309.
Kingdom of God, 14.
Kingu, 132.
Kolita, 357.
Kotaya-hill, 184.
Krishna, 157, 302; legend, 309.
Krishnaism, 38 f.
Kronos, 186, 327.
Kullavagga, 36, 321, 334.

Labbu, 132, 152, 275 f.
Lactantius, 59, 123.
Lalita Vistara, 36 f., 200, 295, 298, 309, 311, 312, 313, 315, 317, 333.
Lamb. *See* "Apocalypse."
Law, the, 218; at Sinai, 335; old and new, 43; and the commandment of love, 174. *See* also "Liberty."
"Lawless one," 137, 160.
Lazarus, brother of Mary and Martha, 195; (various), 283.
Lemuel, 175 f.
Leo (in the Zodiac), 97 f.
Leto, 146, 303.
Liberty (Freedom), 60.
Life, bread of, water of, tree of, 167; book of, 84; after death, **168 ff.** *See* also "Johannine literature."
Light, righteousness compared with, 178. *See* also "Johannine Literature."
Lion, devil as, 134.
Literary and non-literary media (of influence), 41, 43, 50, 57, 325.
Logoi of Greek philosophy, 54.
Logos, 10, 11, 74, 116, 218, 338, 339, **353 f.**, 367.
Lord's Supper, the, **238 ff.**, 370; Paul's view of, 11, **245 ff.**; symbolical conception of, 246; wine, or water and wine at, 263 (cp. 237); debasement of, 252, 370.
Lotus of the Good Law, 37, 124, 330, 360, 361.
Lucian, 32, 210; (Pseudo-) 188.
Luke, Gospel of, 42; and Buddhist Epic, 8 f.
Lunus, 107.
"Lychnomantic" conjurations, 156, cp. 349.
Lydian temples, 27.
Lystra, 341.

Maat, 354.
Maccabaean struggles, 178.
Maccabees, the, 144.
Magadha, 335.
*Maggh*ima-Nikâya, 36, 357.
Magi, 4, 24, 25, 26, 209: in Gospel narrative, **298 ff.**, 306, 370; the Magus Gobryas, 172; the M. Tiridates, 299.
Magian teaching, Magism, 26, 100.
Magical effect of baptism, 223 (cp. 218); effect of naming of Jesus' name, **233 ff.**; invocation, 347; magic ring, 208.
Magog. *See* "Gog."
Mahâbhârata, 38, 165.
Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta, 36, 164, 319, 325, 327, 328, 329, 330, 333, 334, 361, 363, 364.
Mahâvagga, 36, 318, 320, 321, 322 f., 325, 329, 330, 357.
Maînôg-î Khirad, 28, 96.
Maitreya, 362. *See* also "Bodhisattva."
Maklû, 142.
Malta, 341.
Maltaya, 84.
Mammon, 49.
Mandaeans, Mandaeism, 34, 87, 125, 133, 156, 178, 179, 193, 199, 207, 229, 230, **264 f.**, 294, 354, 364; baptism in, 207; the two sacraments of, 264.
Manetho, 22.
Manichaeans, Manichaeism, 34, 133, 156.
Manna, 218.
Mâra, 318.
Marathus, 301.
Marcus, the heretic, 307.
Marduk, 24, 81, 88, 131, 132, 133, 141, 152, 188, 205, 206, 276, 304, 320, 338, 339, 351; resurrection of, **190 f.**
Marriage, **54 ff.**; of victorious god, 320, 370.
Mars, planet or planet-god, 88, 90, 125.
Martha, 278, 284.
Martianus Capella, 101.
Martyrium Polycarpi (20[2]), 345.
Mary, the mother of Jesus, **288 ff.**; annunciation to, 295; her judgment regarding her son, 291; associated with signs of the Zodiac, 293, 304.
Mary, the sister of Martha, 278, 284, 329.
Mary Magdalene, 184, 329.
Massa, 175.
Massacre of the Innocents, 298, **301 ff.**, 305 f.
Mauls, 182.
Mawali Arabs, 311.
Mâyâ, 295.
Mazdeism, Parsism, Persian belief, etc., 5, 8, 14, 15, **24 ff.**, 28, 78, 80,

92, 94, 96, 100, 109, 111, 112 f., 115, 116, 123, 133, 137, 154, 155, 157, 159, 160, 161, 165, 166, 167, 171, 172, 173, 174, 233, 294, 319, 324, 343, 346, 362, 368, 369; eschatology of, **170**; doctrine regarding various heavens, 171 f., 368; and regarding ecstasy, 171 f.; ceremonial law, 178; consciousness of sin, 179; cleansings, 229; resurrection body compared with new heavenly garment, 174, 368; its sacred feast, 264. *See* also "Persia, Persian," "Zarathustra."
Meals, sacred, 260 ff.
Megasthenes, 35.
Megiddo, 127.
Melchizedek, 74.
Memphis, 30.
Men (the god), 107.
Mercury, 90, 125; (=Nabû), 84; -Nebo, 88.
Merkaba, 101.
Merris, 202.
Mêsharu, 323.
Mesopotamia, 20, 87, 265.
Messiah, 199, 232, 272, 294, 298, 300, 303, 305, 316, 317, 346, 363; forerunners of, **139 ff.**, 368; idea of, **143 ff.**; travail of, 146; death and resurrection of, 150; coming to judge the world, 159; Jewish ideas of, not remodelled after Babylonian patterns, 190 f.; pre-existence of, 337 f.; creator of the world, 339; Jewish theology of, 292, 340; Persian, 140, 141, 159.
Messianic feast, 166, 243.
Michael, 93, 110, 173, 339.
Midrash Ekha, 292; M. Rabba, 173.
Militia Christi, 342.
Milk, 347; sour, 143.
Milky Way, 102, 167.
Minucius Felix, 92.
Misor, 324.
Mis pî, 264.
Mithra, Mithraism, Mithras, 1, 24, 25, 25, **30 ff.**, 85, 87, 92, 97, 109, 173, 193, 207, 230, 260, 299, 300, 308, 309, 326, 342, 345 f., 364.
Mithraic bas-reliefs, 181 f., 262, 364; art and Christian, 308 f.; liturgy, 259; Mysteries, *see* "Mysteries."
"Mitra," 26.
Moggallâna, 357.
Mohammed, 357.
Moloch, 163.
Monotheism, 78 ff., 115.
Monotheists, island of, 38.
Monster, conflict of, with deity, 114 f., **129 ff.**
Moon, 88, 89; influence of, 328.
Moral ideas, **174 ff.**
Morality, natural, and Christian, 73, 367.
Mortuary repast, 255.
Mosès, 1, 3, 13, 20, 78, 80, 140, 202, 218, 239, 272, 302, 306, 308 f., 312, 328, 346; body of, 173; Arabian legend of, 282.
Moslems, 136.
Mummu, 82, 338.
Murg, 141.
Mushmahhu, 131.
Mushrushshû, 131.
Music of the spheres, 97.
Musku, 205 f.
Mylitta, 26.
Mystae, 186 f., 260.
Mysteries, 7 f., 13, **230 ff.**, 256, 260, 265, 345, 371; Dionysiac, 347; Eleusinian, **186 f.**, 231, 233, 242; Mithraic, 237, **260 ff.**, 263; moral effects attributed to, 231.
Mystery-cults, 321; -drama, 9, 186; -religion or -religions, 12, 15, 16.
Mythogr. Vat., 257.

Naassenes, 53 f.
Naassenic sermon, **155**, 157 f., 210, 231, 344.
Nabopolassar, 133.
Nabû, 8, 24, 84, 206.
Nabunaid, 23.
Nairanjana, 315.
Nairyô-sangha, 96.
Name, Names, 31; divine, 82; magical influence of, 12, **233 ff.**, 370; formed from the names of Babylonian gods, 23; and of the Amesha Spentas, 27.
Nathanael, 355 f.
National gods, etc., 93 f.
"Natural" medium, etc., 224; n. and Christian morality, 73, 367.
"Nature," 67.
Navel of the earth, 135.
Nazaraeans, 307.
Nazareth, 274, 306 ff.
Nazerini, 308.
Nazoraean, 13, cp. 306 ff.
Nebo, 88, 206 (cp. "Nabû").
Nebuchadnezzar, 131, 133, 135.
Neo-Pythagoreanism, 63.
Nergal, 90.
Nerig, 90.
Nero, 31, 97, 130, 299, 301.
Neuenheim, 181.
Nicodemus, 226; Gospel of, 200.

Nicolaitans, 88.
Nicolaus Damascenus, 23.
Nidânakathâ, 37, 329.
Nineveh, 20.
Ninib, 276, 283 ; -hymn, 131.
Ninsun, 283.
Nirvâ*n*a, 329.
Nisan, 190 f., 195.
Nonnus, 101.
Nosairis, 308, 360.
Nudimmut, 141.
Numbers :—
two witnesses, forerunners, 140 f.
three disciples, 321 ; plagues, 126 ; heavens (perhaps seven), 172 ; days during which soul remains near body, 188 (cp. 195) ; days of obscuration of moon, 188, 191 ; "after three days," 195, 196 f. ; threefold division into heaven, earth, and water, 344, 371 ; triad, 5, 185, **204 ff.**, cp. 369 ; triadic formula of baptism, 204, 214 ; triple immersion at baptism, 208.
π, 142.
three and a half, 142, 189, 191 f., 368.
four living creatures, 97 ff. ; winds, 125.
five disciples, 357.
seven, 14, 85 ; spirits, etc., 83 ; lamps, etc., 85 ; archangels, heavens, 86 ; planet-gods, 87 ; Churches, 87 ; seals, trumpets, etc., 89 ; daemons, 113 ; plagues, 124 ; ages, 124 f. ; kings, 125 ; heads or horns, 129 ; shepherds, 144.
ten horns, or kings, 132.
twelve stars, 101 ; gates, etc., 101 ; disciples of Jesus, 102 f., 321 ; tribes, 103.
fifteen, number of Ishtar, 146.
twenty-four elders, 95.
forty days, 334 f.
seventy or seventy-two, 103 f., 191.
five hundred brethren, 334.
a thousand years, 161.
thirty-six thousand years, etc., 132.

Oannes, 157.
Oaths, 44 f.
Olympian gods, 306.
Omrids, 21.
Onias III., 150.
Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum, 298.
Oriental religions, **29 ff.**
Origen, 1, 32, 173, 185, 204, 210.
Ormazd, Ormazdes, Ormuzd. *See* "Ahura Mazda."
Orphics, Orphism, 29, 77, 353.
Osiris, 97, 183, 188, 194, 305.
Osterburken, 181.

Pahlavi, 28.
Pâli, 9 ; formula, 321.
Palimbothra, 35.
Palmyra, 82.
Panaetius, 62.
Pantaenus, 38.
Papyrus, Berlin Magical, 259, 347 ; of Boulaq, 176 ; Hunefer, 97 ; Leyden, 148, 259 ; London, 259 ; Magical, 156 ; Paris Magical, 307, 336 ; Prisse, 176.
Paradise, 147, 171, 198.
Parentation-formula, 330.
Parsism. *See* "Mazdeism."
Parthian, 126.
Pasargadae, 24.
Pashishu, 152.
Passover, 184, 244 ; time of celebration of, 194 ; Sunday after the, 192 ff.
Pâ*t*aliputta, 165.
Pa*t*isambhidâ-maggo, 36, 359.
Patriarchs, birth of, 297.
Paul, name of, 237 ; historicity of, 13 ; genuineness of his Epistles, 16, 41, 62 f. ; did not possess Greek learning, 2, 32 ; his relation to Stoicism, **55 f.**, 60, **61**, 63, 65 ff., 71, 366 ; his relation to Platonism, 47 ; his relation to Greek philosophy, 32, **68**, **73**, **367** ; and to foreign ideas or usages, 211 ; his deterministic views, 71, 367 ; his views of marriage, **55 f.** ; his doctrine of liberty, 60, 366 ; his Theology, **336 ff.** ; his doctrine of the wrath of God, 71, 367 ; of the universality of sin, 70, 179 ; of the origin of sin, 62 f., 179, 366 ; of the Fall of Adam, 70, cp. 182 ; his estimation of death, 70 ; of the death of Christ, 70, 223, 341 f. ; his doctrine of the first and the last Adam, of the natural and the spiritual man, 152, 366, cp. 290 ; the "Primal Man," 152, **158 f.**, 368 ; his argument for the resurrection, 107, 174, cp. 152, 233 ; his belief in immortality, 69 ; P. and the sacraments, **215 ff.**, **246 ff.**, cp. 11, 370 ; his account of the Lord's Supper, 238 ; his sufferings, 65 ; his scars (probably), 232 ; influence of his own experience on his beliefs, 70, 337 ; caught up to third heaven, 172, cp. 368 ; teaching regarding equality of the sexes, etc., 61, 211, 366, cp. 68 ; his modes of argu-

ment, 158, 219, 252; his writings "occasional" works, 252; (Areopagus discourse) in Athens, **58 ff.**, 366; Churches founded by, 210; his view of friendship, 64; P. and compromise (?), 67; did not attribute magical virtue to name of Jesus, **234 f.**; regarded Sun and Moon as animated, 107, cp. 367; probably presupposes the (Gnostic) speculative idea of the descent of the Saviour, 340.
Pausanias, 27.
Pegasus, 98 f.
Pehtâ, 264.
Peniel, 145.
Pentecost, first Christian, 210, 215, 335.
Perseus, 30.
Persia, Persians, 3, 4, 11, 24, 93, 105, 122 f., 132, 152, 157, 164, 165, 168, 298, 299, 319, 354; P. a volcanic land, 162; Persian tradition, 133; legend, 318; influence on ethics, **177 f.**; detestation of frogs, 127; conception of soul finally forsaking body, 188, 195; Trinity, 207; Messiah, 140, 141, 159; apocalyptic, 123; sacred literature, 77; religion and mode of worship, 80, 182, 209. *See* also "Mazdeism."
Peshawar, 38.
Peter, 102, 280 f., 296, 356; angel of, 110; preaching at Pentecost, 215; the "Washing of Feet," 227; protest and reproof of, 54, 279, 327; his walking upon the sea, 325; keys of, 13, **326 f.**; his question, 279; saying of, 58; P.-legend, 15.
Phenomena, natural, preceding the end, **137 ff.**
Philippica, 26.
Philo Byblius, 21, 324.
Philo Judaeus, 1, 26, 41, 44, 45, 53, 59, 62, 63, 82, 86, 101, 107, 153, 186, 193, 218, 256, 297, 338, 339, 346, 350, 361, 362; and Johannine literature, 74, 321, **353 f.**, cp. 367; and Epistle to the Hebrews, 74, cp. 367; and Paul, 62.
Philosophy, Greek. *See* "Epicureans," "Greek," "Paul," "Plato," "Stoicism," etc.; Greek popular, 58.
Phoenician, 3, 21, 22, 30, 136; cosmology, 116; deity, 81.
Photius, 115.
Phrygia, 4, 30.
Pilate, 285.
Pileatus, 1, 262.
Pirates, defeated by Pompey, 30, 31.
Pit pī, 264.
Plagues, three, 126; seven, 124 f.; of Egypt, 120 f., 127.
Planet-gods, 125.
Planets, 84 f., 88, 90 f., 104; colours for the, 89; subjugation of, 91; and daemons, 113.
Plato, 2, 3, 53, 61, 64, 74, 172, 203, 231; various dialogues, 26, 47, 54, 58, 60, 65, 67 f., 68, 70, 153, 172.
Platonic idea of God, 47; influence on Stoicism, 33; year, 132.
Platonizing, 2, 350.
Plautus, 64.
Pleiades, 86, 88, 334; and daemons, 113.
Pliny, the elder, 23, 261, 299, 308.
Plotinus, 156.
Plutarch, 26, 31, 32, 48, 60, 61, 76, 91, 96, **122**, 123, 127, 188, 231, 258, 343.
Poimandres, 33, 34, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 328, 347, 351, 353, 355. Cp. also "Hermetic literature."
Pompeii, 32.
Pompey, 30, 31, 129, 364.
Pontus, 31.
Porphyrius, 156, 186, 251.
Posidonius, 62.
Pouchya, 298.
Prayer at baptism, 225; in name of Jesus, 236.
Pre-Christian, Jesus, 336; Sunday, 192 ff.; Nazaraeans, 307.
Pre-existence of soul, 70; of Jesus, 337, 371, cp. 360; Buddhist doctrine of, 360.
Primal Man, the, 147, **153 ff.**, 180, 199, 338, 368.
Proclus, 172.
Prophecy, Jewish, 12.
Prophetic view parallel with apocalyptic, 160; ethics, 177; mode of speech, 136, 138.
Prophetism, 175.
Prophets, eschatological theory in, **119 f.**; their consciousness of their vocation, 144; in heathen cults, 210.
Protogonos Phanes, 353.
Ptolemy, 103; Epiphanes, 338.
Purâṇas, 302.
Purusha, 157.
Pythagoras, 53.
ythagoreans, 44, 55, 72; Neo-P., 63.
Pythios, 363.

Ra, 133.
Rabbinical, Rabbis, etc., 12, 50, 51, 57, 93, 100, 153, 189, 218, 316, 333.
Râgagṛiha, 334.

Rahab, 288 ; (monster), 129.
Râhula, 36.
Ramku, 152, 276.
Raphael, 83.
Raven as Babylonian constellation, 98.
Religious-historical interpretation, its history, **1 ff.** ; its method, **16 ff.** ; its presuppositions, **20 ff.** ; cp. 372 f.
Repentance, 43, 232.
Resurrection, 168 ; of Jesus, **188 ff.** ; Paul's argument for, 107, 174, cp. 152, 233 ; r. body, 173 f., 368.
Rgya tcher rol pa, 295, 315, 357, 364.
Rhodes, 186.
Righteousness, **174 ff.** ; compared with light, 178.
Rig Veda, 18, 157.
Ritual, emphasis on, 178.
Roman Empire, 128, 130 ; R. Hellenism, 41 ; literature and thought, 51, 52, 58, 75 ; religion, **29**.
Romans, the, 3.
Rome, 34, 128, 260 ; Church at, 72.
Romulus, 203, 301, 308.
Rosetta Stone, 338.
Rudraka, 357.
Rûhâ, 207.
Ruth, 288.

Sabazius, 30.
Sabbath, 14, 193, cp. 197.
Sabians, 87.
Sacaea, 183, 186, 190.
Sacrament, baptism as, **215 ff.** ; Lord's Supper as, **243 ff.** ; of unction, 236.
Sacrifice, **254 ff.** ; of kings' sons, 341 ; human, 185 f.
Sagittarius, 99.
Sallustius Philosophus, 347.
Samaṇas, 320.
Samaria, Samaritans, 143, 213, 341, 358; woman of S., **277 f.**, 355, 358.
Samson, 271 f., 295.
Samuel, 271 f., 311, 312.
Saṃyutta-Nikâya, 36, 322.
Sanchuniathon, 21.
Sanhedrîn (Talmud), 184, 309.
Saoshyant, 154, 157, 159, 166, 173, 262, 294, 362.
Sapiential literature. *See* "Wisdom literature."
Sapphira, 343.
Sarah, 112.
Sargon I., 293.
Sâriputta, 357.
Sassanian Avesta, 28.
Sassanids, 34.
Satan, **113 ff.**, 136 f., 173, 368 ; "delivered unto S.," 234 f., 343.
Saturn, 88, 89, 125 ; -Nergal, 90.
Saul, 272.
Saviour, "descent" of, 199, 340 ; "appearance" of, 341 ; hope of coming, 313 ; myth of S.-king, 146, 310, cp. 298.
Scipio, 203.
Scorpio, 98, 99.
Scorpion-man, 98.
Scythian, 134.
Seleucids, 31.
Seleucus Nicator, 35.
Selik, 351.
Semitic religions and influences, **21 f.**, 319.
Seneca, 41, 43–46, 57, 58, 61–73, 75, 76, 163.
Septuagint, 41 ; translators of, 103.
Serapis, 31, 259.
Serpent in story of the Fall, 114, 180 f.
Servant of Jahweh, **148 f.**
Servius (Pseudo-), 333.
Set (Phoenician), 136.
Sharistâni, 142.
Shemhamphorash (late work), 108.
Sheol, 170, 343.
Shepherd, of Hermas, 34 ; Jesus as, **346 f.** (cp. 355), 371 ; shepherds at birth of Jesus, **308 f.**
Shu, the god, 99.
Sidon, 30.
Siduri-Sabîtu, 269, 323.
Siloam, 280.
Simeon, 312.
Simon, *see* "Peter" ; Magus, 341.
Simplicity of life, 56.
Simulata occisio, 230.
Sin, **179 ff.** ; freedom from, 60 ; universality of sin, 70, 179 ; intensification of, preceding the end, 117, 121, 123, 124 ; compared with darkness, 178 ; origin of, 62 f., 179, 366, cp. 224 ; forgiveness of, 212, 231, 242, cp. 370 ; "retaining" and forgiving sins, 326 ; list of vices, 63, 366 ; sexual vices, 64. *See* also "Jesus," "Paul."
Sin (the god), 283.
Sinai, 335.
Sippar, 24.
Sirius, 95, 100.
Sîrozâh, 100.
Slaves, Slavery, 75 ; equalization with masters, 211, cp. 61.
Socrates, 48, 54, 58, 61, 73.
Sodales Titii, 29.
Sol, 260.
Solomon, 21, **175 f.** ; his temple, 87.

Son of Man, 85, **150 ff.**, 202, 368.
Soul, pre-existence of, 70, 360 ; transmigration of, 340, 360 ; forsaking body after death, 188, 195 ; separation from body in ecstasy, 69, 171 f.
Speaking with tongues. *See* "Glossolalia."
Spenta Ârmaiti, 324.
Spenta Mainyu, 115, 116.
Spirit, of God, 116 ; Holy, **204 ff.** ; gift of the Holy S., 226 ; not female, 206 ; the S. and fire, 314 ; and dove, 316, 370 ; as Advocate, 362.
Spirits. *See* "Daemons."
Spitting, 342, 370.
Sraosha, 173.
Star at birth of Jesus, 300, 370.
Statius, 32.
Stele of the vultures, 166.
Stephen, 150, 151.
Stobaeus, 53, 75.
Stoic-Cynic, 49.
Stoicism, 13, 33, 43, 44, 45, 50, 55 f., 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 68, 70, 74, 314, 366 f. ; and Christianity, 42 ; and N.T., 46 ; and slavery, 75 ; and the state, 72 ; and friendship, 64 ; doctrine of evil and good, 72 ; doctrine of God, **45 f.**, 59 ; doctrine of the "Wise Man," 60 f., 65, 71, 75 ; doctrine of "body and members," 67, 367 ; doctrine of "nature," 67, 367 ; belief in universal conflagration, 164 ; aphorisms of, 65.
Strabo, 23, 27, 31, 35.
Stratonicea, 351.
Suetonius, 299, 301.
Sufjani, 136.
Sun (in Rev 2), 88.
Sunday, **192 ff.**
Sutta-Nipâta, 36.
Sydyk, 324.
Symmachus, 292.
Synagogue, 209.
Syncellus, 132.
Syncretism, 22 f.
Synoptic Gospels, trustworthiness of, 41, cp. 286 f. ; order of compilation of, 42 ; tradition of, 42.
Syracuse, 36.
Syria, Syrian, 31, 81, 113, 251, 301.

Tabernacles, Feast of, 280.
Tabitha, 305.
Tabû, 191.
Tacitus, 97.
Talmud, 32, 189, 305, 307 ; cp. 93, 184, 309.
Tamar, 288.
Tammuz, 89, 90, 183, 269, 293 f.
Tanhumah, 52.
Tarsus, 30, 32, 61, 264.
Tathâgato, 359, 362.
Tattooing, 232.
Taurobolia, 231, 263.
Taurus (in the Zodiac), 86, 88, 97, 98, 99, 132.
Tell el Amarna, 20, 104.
Temple, polemic against, 58 ; candlesticks in, 85 ; Solomon's, 87 ; vine in, 364.
Tertullian, 230, 239, 252.
Thebes, 20.
Theocles, 75.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 115.
Theodotion, 292.
Theophanies, 340 f., 370.
Theopompus, 26, 91, 170.
Therapeutae, 193.
Thomas, 102.
Thot, 85 ; -Hermes, 354.
Thracian, 30.
Thucydides, 29.
Thyatira, 88.
Tiâmat, 82, 131, 132, 141, 166 f., 180.
Tiberius, 31.
Tibet, 38.
Tiridates, 97, 299.
Tishhu, 152, 275 f.
Tistrya, 94.
Transcendentalism, 82, 83, 159, 319, 339.
Transmigration of souls, 340, 360.
Travail, of the Messiah, 146 ; "beginning of t.," 124.
Tree of Life, 147, 167, 181.
Triad, Triadic expression. *See* "Numbers."
Tribes, the Ten, 21, 154, 165, 277.
Trichotomy of man's nature, 64.
Tsin dynasty, 37.
Tullia, 203.
Turkestan, 36.
Typhon, 133, 304, 306.
Tyre, King of, 153.

Upatishya, 36.
Upatissa, 357.
Upâvana, 327.
UR-GU-LA, 97.
Uriel, 139.
Urim and Thummim, 361.
Ursa Major, 100.
Ursa Minor, 85.
Uruk, 24.
Utnapishtim, 169, 269, 278, 279.
Uttarâdhyayana, 332.

Varak, 105.
Vayu, 154.

Vedânta philosophy, 353.
Vegetarianism, 72, 367.
Vendîdâd, 127, 165, 166, 173, 177, 178, 195, 200, 318.
Venus, 88, 89, 90, 109.
Vergil, 336.
Vespasian, 31.
Vettius Valens, 107.
Vices. *See* "Sin."
Vinaya, 36.
Virgin Birth, **288 ff.**, cp. 146.
Vishṇu-Nârâyaṇa, 157.
Vohu Manô, 27, 116, 173.

Washing of robes, 105.
Ways, the Two, 51.
We-sections in Book of the Acts, 197, 287.
Winds, 100.
"Wisdom," 32, 320, 323 f., 339, 370; intermediary being, 338; "the rock" as W., 218.
Wisdom literature, **175 ff.**
Wise Man. *See* "Stoicism."
Wise Men. *See* "Magi."
Woman, equalization of, with man, 61, 211, 366, cp. 68; seduction of, by daemons, 112.
Word of God, 82, 367, cp. "Logos."
World, perishable, and world of ideas, 74, 367.
World-egg, 96.
Worship, divine, **208 ff.**, 369.

Xenophon, 48.
Xisuthros, 269 f., 279 f., 284.

Yama. *See* "Yima."
Yasna, 28, 115, 166, 174, 177, 324; Haptanghâiti, 28.
Yast, 28, 94, 100, 113, 133, 139, 154, 157, 161, 171, 173, 177, 182, 195.
Yazatas, 24, 25, 31, 96, 111.
Yima, 147, 154, 161, 165, 167, 182, 200, 346.

Zacharias, 272, 289.
Zalbatanu, 90.
Zarathustra, Zoroaster, Zoroastrianism, 4, 10, 26, 111, 156, 172, 200, 294, 299, 302, 318. *See* also "Mazdeism."
Zebedee, sons of, 90.
Zerubbabel, 140.
Zeus, 26, 341; chariot of, 100.
Zodiac, 4, 88, 97 ff., 292 f., 304.
Zoroaster. *See* "Zarathustra."
Zosimus, 155 f.

II. INDEX OF SCRIPTURE TEXTS AND OTHER REFERENCES.

A.—OLD TESTAMENT.

GENESIS.

	PAGE
1	8, 158
1 f.	153
1^{2}	116, 147
$1^{26f.}$	338
1^{27} 2^{7}	158
$2^{8.\ 10ff.}$	180
3	114, 153, 180
5^{3}	158
6	112
8^{21}	179
10	103
14^{18}	81
15	272
21^{1} 25^{21} 29^{31}	297
32^{3}	108
$32^{25ff.}$	145
49	103

EXODUS.

	PAGE
2^{15}	306
2^{22}	297
3	272
3^{5}	109
4^{19}	306
6^{23}	272
$7^{8ff.}$	120 f.
12^{46}	184
$13^{2ff.}$	310
20^{4}	344
20^{8}	192
24^{8}	239, 244
$25^{31ff.}$	85
$28^{17ff.}$	101
34^{28}	317
$39^{10ff.}$	101

LEVITICUS.

	PAGE
$12^{2ff.}$	311
26	120

NUMBERS.

9^{12}	184
11^{27}	129
24^{17}	298

DEUTERONOMY.

5^{8}	344
$9^{9.\ 18}$	317
10^{17}	351
19^{15}	228
30^{13}	198
31^{14}	173
32^{5}	73

DEUTERONOMY—*contd.*

PAGE

32[8] . . . 59
32[8f.] . . . 93

JOSHUA.

5[13ff.] . . . 108 f.
10 . . . 136

JUDGES.

5[3] . . . 136
5[20] . . . 108
9[37] . . . 135

1 SAMUEL.

1[24ff.] . . . 311
29[9] . . . 151

2 SAMUEL.

14[17. 20] . . . 145

1 KINGS.

5[10f. 14] . . . 175
7[49] . . . 87
18[1] . . . 192
19[8] . . . 317
22[19] . . . 109

2 KINGS.

4[42ff.] . . . 324
17[30f.] . . . 277

1 CHRONICLES.

21[1] . . . 114

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.

— . . . 319

JOB.

1[6ff.] . . . 114
9[13] . . 129, 131
15[7f.] . . . 153
26[12f.] . . . 129
31[1] . . . 44
38[41] . . . 50
40[15ff.] . . . 176
40[23] . . . 34

PSALMS.

8[7] . . . 150
16[10] . . . 188
22[19] . . . 364
24[4] . . . 192
47[6. 9] . . . 148
50[14] . . . 177
74[8] . . . 209
74[13ff.] . . . 129
78[24f.] . . . 218
89[11ff.] . . . 129
93[1] 97[1] 99[1] . . 148

PSALMS—*contd.*

PAGE

103[21] . . . 108
104[2] . . . 351
105[39ff.] . . . 218
110[1] . . . 148
118[22] . . . 348
136[3] . . . 351
147[9] . . . 50
148[2] . . . 109

PROVERBS.

2[16] . . . 177
2[16f.] . . . 32
6[24] 7[5] . . . 177
8[30] . . . 323
23[27] . . . 177
24[21] . . . 348
30[1] . . . 175
30[4] . . . 153
31[1] . . . 175

ECCLESIASTES.

8[15] . . . 330

ISAIAH.

1[2] . . . 136
1[13] . . . 192
1[16] . . . 213
4[2] . . . 308
5[25ff.] . . . 120
6[3] . . . 205
6[4] . . . 335
7[14] 144, 146, 291, 292
7[14ff.] . . **143 f.**
8[1ff.] . . . 143
8[9f.] . . . 136
9[1ff.] . . **144 f.**
9[4] . . 146, 147
9[6] . . . 145
9[7ff.] 10[1ff.] . . 120
11[1] . . . 308
11[1ff.] . . **146 f.**
11[4] . . . 160
11[6ff.] . . . 147
11[12ff.] . . . 136
14[12ff.] . . . 90
22[11] . . . 139
22[22] . . . 326
24 ff. . . . 95
24[22] . . . 160
24[23] . . . 95
25[1] . . . 145
25[6] . . . 166
26[19] . . . 170
27[1] 28[16ff.] . . 130
30[7] . . . 129
37[26] . . . 139
43[20f.] . . . 47
44[5] . . . 232

ISAIAH—*contd.*

PAGE

45[1ff.] . . . 24
45[7f.] . . . 115
47[7] . . . 145
51[9] . . . 131
51[9f.] . . . 129
53 . . **148 f.**
55[1] . . . 359
57[15] . . . 145
58[11] . . . 359
59[17] . . . 343
60[6] . . . 300
60[19] . . . 165
63[11] . . . 346
65[4] . . . 255
65[17] . . . 165
66[17] . . . 255
66[22] . . . 165

JEREMIAH.

— . . 120, 162
1[14f.] . . . 136
2[26f.] . . . 21
4[14] . . . 213
4[23] . . . 147
7[30f.] . . . 22
9[22f.] . . . 69
14[12] 21[7] . . 126
23[5] . . . 308
24[10] . . . 126
28[16f.] . . . 343
29[17f.] . . . 126
31[15] . . . 305
32[29] . . . 22
33[15] . . . 308
42[17] . . . 126
44[13] . . . 126

LAMENTATIONS.

5[3] . . . 292

EZEKIEL.

1 . . 98, 101
1[5ff.] . . . 97
1[24] . . . 97
9 . . . 83 ff.
10[1ff.] . . . 97
13[17ff.] 14[1ff.] . . 23
14[13ff.] . . . 120
28[13f.] . . . 153
28[13ff.] . . . 101
29[4ff.] 32[3ff.] . . 136
34[11] . . . 346
38 f. . . . 134
38[4. 6] . . . 136
38[12] . . . 135
38[15] . . . 136
38[19f.] . . . 135

EZEKIEL—*contd.*

	PAGE
39[11. 12. 14ff.]	135
39[17ff.]	166
47[1ff.]	167
48[30ff.]	101

DANIEL.

	PAGE
—	319
7	152, 154
7 f.	129
7[2f.]	152
7[3ff.]	129
7[8]	131
7[10f.]	162
7[11]	131
7[13]	151
7[25]	131, 142
7[27]	151
8[2f.]	105
8[3ff.]	129
8[10]	132, 137
8[15] 9[21]	151
9[27]	127
10[12ff.]	109
10[13. 20f.] 11[1]	93
11[31]	127
11[40ff.]	136
12[1]	93
12[2]	170

DANIEL—*contd.*

	PAGE
12[7]	142
12[11]	127
12[11f.]	142

HOSEA.

	PAGE
2[17]	21
6[6]	176
9[10]	21
11[1]	306

JOEL.

	PAGE
2[20]	136

AMOS.

	PAGE
4[5ff.]	119
5[18]	138
7[1ff.]	119
9[3]	129

JONAH.

	PAGE
—	14
1[3]	102

MICAH.

	PAGE
—	162
5[1]	308

MICAH—*contd.*

	PAGE
5[1ff.]	144, 145
5[2. 4]	146

ZEPHANIAH.

	PAGE
—	161
1[5]	22
2[13]	136

ZECHARIAH.

	PAGE
—	83
1[8]	125
3[1ff.]	114
3[8]	308
3[9]	85
4[2ff.]	85, 140
4[10]	106
6[1f. 5. 6f. 8]	125
6[12]	308
12[8]	145
12[9]	150
12[10]	149 f.
12[11]	150
13[1]	359
13[4]	271
14[1ff.]	136
14[10]	165

MALACHI.

	PAGE
3[23f.]	140

B.—NEW TESTAMENT.

MATTHEW.

	PAGE
1	288
1[16]	288
1[18ff.]	288 f.
1[23]	291
2	299, 301
2[9]	300
2[15]	306
2[18]	305
2[20]	306
2[23]	306, 308
3[11]	314
3[15]	315
3[16]	314
4[17]	179
4[24]	328
5[1. 3ff.]	318
5[8]	166
5[16]	319
5[21ff.]	43
5[28. 34]	44
5[39ff.]	45

MATTHEW—*contd.*

	PAGE
5[48]	46, 366
6[1ff.]	48
6[8]	48
6[12]	46, 179
6[19ff.]	48
6[24]	49
6[25ff.]	49
6[34] 7[1ff. 6]	50
7[7]	51
7[11]	46, 179
7[12]	51
7[13f.]	51, 57, 366
7[16]	51, 57, 366
7[21]	51
7[22]	234 f.
8[12]	171
8[20]	320
8[22ff.]	52
10[23]	214
10[29f.]	50
11[14]	140

MATTHEW—*contd.*

	PAGE
11[16f.]	53
11[19]	323
12[36]	53
12[40]	198
12[44]	112
12[45]	113
14[25ff. 28ff.]	325
15[11. 17]	53
16[10]	278
16[17]	102
16[18]	208, 326
16[18f.]	13
16[19]	326 f.
16[23]	327
17[10ff.]	140
17[15]	328
18[8f.]	44
18[10]	110
18[15ff.]	208 f.
18[16]	228
18[20]	201

MATTHEW—*contd.*

PAGE

19[12] . . . 54
19[28] . . 103, 165
21[18] . . 187, 284
21[19] . . . 187
22[1ff.] . . . 320
22[13] . . . 171
23[3] . . . 57
24[8] . . . 124
24[11-13] . . . 128
24[15] . . . 127 f.
24[40f.] . . . 161
24[48ff.] . . . 57
25[1ff.] . . . 320
25[14ff.] . . . 332
25[30] . . . 171
25[31ff.] . . . 173
25[40] . . . 177
26[28] . . 238, 242
26[53] . . . 106
27[16f.] . . . 185
27[51] . . . 333
28[18] . . . 201
28[19] . . 204, 214
28[20] . . . 201

MARK.

1[4] . . . 212
1[11] . . . 232
1[13] . . . 317
1[15] . . 179, 318
1[21ff.] . . . 276
2[17] . . 52, 57, 366
2[19f.] . . . 320
3[14] . . . 321
3[17] . . . 90
3[18] . . . 102
3[21] . . . 291
3[24f.] . . . 52
3[29] . . . 321
3[31f. 33f.] . . . 291
4 322
4[3ff.] . . . 53
4[11] . . . 263 f.
4[39] . . . 110
5[7] . . . 81
5[9] . . . 236
6[6ff.] . . . 322
6[30ff. 81ff.] . . . 324
8[20] . . . 278
8[31] . . . 197
8[31f.] . . . 54
8[31ff.] . . . 327
8[33] . . . 279
8[36] . . . 54
9[2ff.] . . 140, 327
9[7] . . . 296
9[11ff.] . . . 140
9[31] . . . 197

MARK—*contd.*

PAGE

9[38f.] . . . 233
9[43ff.] . . . 44
10[17ff.] . . . 330 f.
10[21] . . . 44
10[34] . . . 197
11[8ff.] . . . 331
11[12] . . . 284
11[16] . . . 186
11[27] . . . 57
11[30] . . . 215
12[25] . . . 54
12[29ff.] . . . 57
12[41ff.] . . . 331
13[7ff.] . . . 117
13[8] . . . 124
13[14] . . . 127
13[24f.] . . 106, 137
14[24] . . . 238
14[61] . . . 81
15[23] . . . 183
15[33] . . . 333
15[45] . . . 187
16[2] . . . 195
16[9] . . . 113
16[15f.] . . . 214
16[16] . . . 226
16[17] . . . 235
16[17f.] . . . 234

LUKE.

1[15] . . . 271
1[19] . . 83, 93
1[20] . . . 289
1[26] . . 83, 93
1[27ff.] . . **289 f.**
1[35] . . . 296
1[39ff.] . . . 296
2[1ff.] . . . 308
2[5] . . . 288
2[9ff.] . . . 309
2[13] . . . 106
2[14] . . . 309 f.
2[19] . . . 309
2[22ff.] . . **310 ff.**
2[27] . . . 312
2[36] . . . 55
2[40] . . . 312
2[51] . . . 313
2[52] . . . 312
3 288
3[3] . . . 212
3[16] . . . 314
3[22] . . 232, 316
3[23] . . 288, 360
4[13] . . . 318
4[14. 16] . . . 274
4[23] . . 52, 366
4[25] . . . 192

LUKE—*contd.*

PAGE

4[28] . . . 57
5 280
6[31] . . . 51
6[39] . . . 50
6[44. 46] . . . 51
7[33] . . . 271
7[35] . . . 323
7[36ff.] . . 284, 329
8[2] . . . 113
8[30] . . . 236
9[26] . . . 208
9[49] . . . 233
9[58] . . . 320
10[1] . . . 103
10[17] . 103, 234, 236
10[18] . . 106, 276
10[20] . . . 84
10[38ff.] . . 284, 329
10[42] . . . 56
11[4] . . 46, 179
11[9] . . . 51
11[13] . . 46, 179
11[26] . . . 113
11[27f.] . . . 329 f.
11[49] . . . 323
12[6f.] . . . 50
12[16ff.] . . . 49
12[19] . . . 330
12[22f.] . . . 49
12[33f.] . . . 48
12[45ff.] . . . 57
13[23f.] . . . 51
13[26] . . . 234
14[12ff.] . . . 56
14[16ff.] . . . 320
14[28ff.] . . . 56
14[35] . . . 43
15 46
15[11ff.] . . . 330
15[18. 21] . . . 320
16[1ff.] . . . 56
16[10ff.] . . . 49
16[12] . . . 57
16[13] . . . 49
16[19ff.] . . . 283
16[22] . . . 172
16[22ff.] . . . 168
16[24] . . . 169
17[3] . . . 209
17[34f.] . . . 161
18[11] . . . 63
19[11ff.] . . . 332
21[1ff.] . . . 331
21[11] . . . 123
22[15-18] . . . 238
22[17f.] . . . 241
22[19] . . . 238 f.
22[20] . . . 239 f.

LUKE—*contd.*

PAGE

22[30] . . . 103
23[43] . 168, 173, 198

JOHN.

1[1ff.] . . . 74
1[14] . . . 356
1[16] . . 348, 371
1[18] . . 47, 356
1[29] . . . 273
1[35ff.] . . 274, 276
1[38] . . . 271
1[43] . . . 102
1[48] . . . 355
2[1ff.] . . . 358
3[3] . . 231, 355
3[5] . . 226, 228
3[7] . . . 231
3[16. 18] . . . 356
3[24] . . . 278
3[29] . . . 320
4[1ff.] . . . 358 f.
4[9] . . . 358
4[10ff.] . . . 359
4[17f.] . . . 355
4[21] . . . 58
4[39] . . . 355
5[3f.] . . . 110
6 . . . 278, 370
6 ff. . . . 282
6[48-63] . . **253 f.**
6[53] . . . 265
6[66. 68. 70 7[34] . . 279
7[38] . . 9, 359
8[21] . . . 279
8[44] . . . 179
8[56ff.] . . . 359 f.
9 280
9[2] . . . 360
10[11] . . 346, 371
10[14] . . 346, 371
10[23] . . . 57
10[40] . . . 271
11[6. 39] . . . 195
11[51] . . . 361
12 . . . 282
12[24] . . . 233
12[28] . . . 279
12[31] . . . 112
12[34] . . 9, 361
13[2ff.] . . . 227 f.
13[4-11] . . . 187
13[8. 9f.] . . . 227
14[2f.] . . . 173
14[13f.] . . . 236
14[16] . . . 362
14[25f.] . . . 355
14[26] . . . 362
14[30] . . . 112

JOHN—*contd.*

PAGE

15[1] . . . 363 f., 371
15[16] . . . 236
15[26 16[7] . . 362
16[11] . . . 112
16[13] . . . 363
16[24. 26] . . . 236
19[23f.] . . . 364
19[30] . . . 187
19[33ff.] . . . 183
19[34] . . . 227
19[34f.] . . . 228
20[31] . . . 236
21 . . . 280, 282
21[15ff.] . . . 102

ACTS.

1[3] . . . 334
2 . . . 210, 335
2[24. 27. 31] . . 198
2[38] . 212, 215, 226
2[42. 46] . . . 241
3[6] . . . 236
3[15] . . 173, 203
3[16 4[7. 10. 17f.] . . 236
4[19] . . . 58
4[31] . . 335, 370
5[9f.] . . . 343
5[15] . . . 296
5[28] . . . 236
5[29] . . . 58
5[31] . . 173, 203
5[40] . . . 236
6[15] . . . 151
7[42] . . . 106
7[47ff.] . . . 58
7[56] . . 150, 173
7[59] . . . 200
8[10] . . . 341
8[15ff.] . . . 226
9[27f.] . . . 236
9[39ff.] . . . 102
10[44] . . . 226
10[46 11[15] . . 210
11[30] . . . 209
12[15] . . . 110
13[9] . . . 237
13[11] . . . 343
14[11ff.] . . . 341
14[17] . . . 59
14[23] . . . 210
15[2. 4. 6. 22f. 16[4] . 209
16[18] . . . 236
17[18] . . . 58
17[24ff.] . **58 ff.**, 366
17[28] . . . 50
18[25] . . . 336
19[6] . . . 226
20[7] . . 197, 241

ACTS—*contd.*

PAGE

20[17] . . . 210
20[24. 35] . . . 60
21[18] . . . 209
22[16] . . 212, 226
28[6] . . . 341

ROMANS.

1[19f.] . . . 59
1[23] . . . 58
1[25] . . 58, 81
1[28. 29ff.] . . 63
2[14f.] . . . 59
2[28f.] . . . 69
3[9. 22f.] . . . 70
3[23] . 179, 182, 368 f.
4[17] . . . 82
5[12] . . 70, 179
5[20] . . . 220
6 . . . **219 ff.**
6[3f.] . . . 222
6[5] . . . 232
6[6] . . . 61
6[18. 20. 22 7[3] . . 60
7[9. 15] . . . 70
7[18. 25] . . . 62
8[2] . . . 60
8[3] . . . 339
8[3f.] . . . 221
8[3ff. 12f.] . . . 62
8[20ff.] . . . 70
8[21] . . . 60
8[28. 35] . . . 71
8[33] . . 106, 110
8[39] . . . 107
9 . . . 71, 367
9[5] . . 81, 337
9[8] . . . 296
9[22ff.] . . . 71
10[7] . . . 198
11 . . . 367
11[26ff.] . . . 71
11[36] . . 59, 208
12[1] . . . 72
12[2] . . . 68
12[3] . . . 72
12[4f.] . . . 212
12[4ff.] . . 67, 367
12[19 13 . . . 72
13[7] . . . 211
13[9] . . . 57
13[11] . . . 72
13[13] . . . 63
13[14] . . . 61
14 . . . 72
14 f. . . . 367
14[5] . . . 194
14[21] . . . 263
15[7] . . . 67

ROMANS—*contd.*

PAGE

15$^{7ff.}$ . . . 72
16^{26} . . . 344

1 CORINTHIANS.

1 215
1$^{11ff.}$ . . . 64 f.
1$^{13ff.}$ . . . 214
1$^{14ff.}$ . . . 225
1^{17} . . 65, 214
1^{21} . . . 59
1^{31} . . . 69
2^{6} . . 110, 235
2$^{7ff.}$ . . 340, 371
2^{8} . . . 235
2$^{14f.}$ . . 65, 366
3$^{1ff.\ 4ff.}$ . . . 65
3$^{12ff.}$ . . . 163
3$^{13.\ 15}$ . . . 161
3^{16} . 65, 112, 366
3$^{18ff.}$ . . . 65
3^{21} . . 65, 366
3$^{22f.}$ . . . 65
4$^{1ff.}$ . . 65, 366
4$^{9ff.}$ . . . 65
5$^{3f.}$ . . . 234
5^{5} . . 343, 371
5^{7} 187
5$^{10f.}$ . . . 63
5^{11} . . . 66
6^{7} . . . 45
6$^{9f.}$ . . . 63
6^{11} . 217, 233, 235
6^{19} . . . 65
7 54
7^{5} . . . 56
7$^{17ff.}$ . . 66, 366
7$^{21f.}$ . . . 66
7^{26} . . . 117
7^{29} . . . 55
7$^{29f.}$ . . . 66
7^{35} . . . 56
7^{39} . . . 60
8$^{5f.}$ . . . 337
8^{6} . . . 73
8^{11} . . 67, 366
9$^{1.\ 19}$ . . . 60
9$^{19ff.\ 24ff.}$ . . . 67
10$^{1ff.}$ . . . 217 f.
10$^{3f.}$ . . 219, 247
10^{11} . . . 54
10$^{16ff.}$ . . **247 ff.**
10^{17} . . . 241
10^{29} . . . 60
11^{1} . . . 67
11$^{3ff.}$ . . 61, 211
11^{7} . . . 338
11^{14} . . 67, 367
11$^{20f.}$ . . 252, 370

1 CORINTHIANS—*contd.*

PAGE

11^{23} . **240 f.**, 242
11$^{23ff.}$ 238, **246**, 250 f.
11^{26} . . . 245
11$^{26ff.}$ . . . 250
11$^{26\ or\ 27ff.}$ . . . 251
12$^{4ff.}$ . . . 204
12^{10} . . . 210
12$^{12ff.}$. 67, 212, 367
12^{13} . . 215, 219
13 67
13$^{11f.}$ . . . 68
14^{16} . . . 212
14$^{26ff.}$ . . . 210
14^{34} . . . 68
14$^{34f.}$ . . 61, 211
15^{3} . . 240, 242
15$^{3f.}$ . . . 222
15^{4} . . . 187
15$^{4f.}$ . . . 195
15^{6} . . . 334
15^{20} . . . 247
15^{21} . . . 179
15^{24} . 106, 110, 235
15^{27} . . . 150
15^{28} . . . 160
15^{29} . . . 219
15$^{32f.}$ . . . 50
15$^{35ff.}$ . . . 174
15^{37} . . . 233
15$^{40f.}$ . . . 107
15$^{45ff.}$ . . 152 f., 368
15$^{47.\ 49}$ . . . 158
15^{50} . . . 247
15^{52} . . . 93
16^{2} . . . 197

2 CORINTHIANS.

2$^{5ff.}$ . . . 343
2$^{14ff.}$ . . . 171
3^{17} . . . 60
3^{18} . . . 68
3$^{18ff.}$ . . . 47
4^{4} . . 233, 338
4^{6} . . 82, 233
4^{7} . . 68, 367
4$^{8ff.}$ . . . 65
4^{16} . . . 68
5 367
5^{1} . . 68, 367
5$^{1ff.}$. 168, 174, 368
5^{2} . . . 68
5^{3} . . . 69
5^{4} . . . 68
5^{9} . . . 69
5^{17} . . . 68
6^{14} . . . 66
6^{15} . . . 114
6^{16} . . . 112

2 CORINTHIANS—*contd.*

PAGE

7$^{8ff.}$ . . . 343
10$^{12ff.}$ . . . 69
11^{2} . . . 320
11$^{23ff.}$ . . . 65
11^{31} . . . 81
12$^{2f.}$ . . 69, 367
12$^{2ff.}$ . . 172, 368
12^{15} . . . 69
12$^{20f.}$ . . . 63
13^{1} . . . 228
13^{14} . . . 204

GALATIANS.

2^{4} . . . 60
2^{20} . . . 61
2^{21} . . . 70
3 110
3^{10} . . . 70
3^{19} . . . 346
3^{26} . . . 217
3^{27} . 61, 216 f., 232
3^{28} . . 61, 366
4$^{3ff.}$ . . . 106
4$^{9f.}$ . . . 61
4^{14} . . 342, 371
4^{23} . . . 296
4$^{23f.\ 26}$ . . . 60
4^{29} . . . 296
4$^{30f.}$ 5^{1} . . . 60
5^{13} . . 60, 62
5^{14} . . . 57
5$^{19ff.}$ . . . 63
5^{24} . . . 61
6$^{2.\ 4}$ . . . 64
6^{14} . . . 61
6^{17} . . . 232

EPHESIANS.

1$^{15ff.}$ . . . 349
1^{18} . . 345, 371
1$^{18f.}$ . . . 349
1^{21} . . . 106
1^{22} . . . 150
1^{23} . . . 348
2^{2} . . . 113
2^{22} . . . 112
3^{9} . . 345, 371
3$^{14ff.}$ . . . 349
3^{15} . . . 74
3^{18} . . . 349
3^{19} . . . 348
4^{3} . . . 172
4^{9} . . . 198
4^{13} . . . 348
4^{31} . . . 63
5^{1} . . . 47
5^{2} . . . 171
5$^{3.\ 5}$ . . . 63

EPHESIANS—*contd.*

PAGE

5[26] . . . 226
6[5ff.] . . . 75
6[11ff.] . . 172, 342
6[12] . . . 113

PHILIPPIANS.

1[23] . . . 168
2[6] . . . 93
2[6f.] . **158 f.**, 368
2[7] . . . 339
2[9] . . . 337
2[9f.] . . . 201
2[10] . 235, 343, 371
2[11] . . . 337
2[13] . . . 71
2[15] . . . 73
2[17] . . . 69
3[10ff.] . . . 73
3[13f.] . . . 67
4[3] . . . 84
4[8] . . 73, 367
4[18] . . . 171

COLOSSIANS.

1[13] . . . 222
1[15] . . . 338
1[18f.] . . . 73
1[16] . . . 110
1[19] . . . 348
2[8ff.] . . . 106
2[9] . . . 348
2[10] . . 110, 348
2[11ff.] . . 222 f.
2[15] . 91, 110, 235
2[16] . . . 61
2[16ff.] . . . 73
2[17] . . . 75
3[5. 8] . . . 63
3[9f.] . . . 68
3[11] . . 61, 366
3[17] . . . 235

1 THESSALONIANS.

3[1] . . . 64
4[13ff.] . . . 217
4[16] . . . 93
5[7] . . . 219
5[8] . . . 342
5[23] . . . 64

2 THESSALONIANS.

1[8] . . . 161
2[3] . . . 117
2[8] . 160, 341, 371
2[9] . . . 137
2[13f.] . . . 204
3[6] . . . 234

1 TIMOTHY.

PAGE

1[4] . . . 350
1[9f.] . . . 63
1[17] . . . 351
1[20] . . . 343
2[5] . . . 345
2[15 3[2]] . . . 54
3[6] . . . 226
3[12] . . . 54
3[16] . . 172, 368
4[3] . . . 54
5[1] . . . 75
5[9] . . . 54
5[17. 19] . . . 210
5[21] . . . 208
5[23] . . . 75
6[15f.] . . . 351

2 TIMOTHY.

1[10] . . 345, 371
2[19] . . 349, 371
3[1ff.] . . . 118
3[16] . . 350, 371
4[17] . . . 134

TITUS.

1[5] . . . 210
1[6] . . . 55
1[12] . . . 50
3[4] . . . 350
3[5] . . . 226
3[9] . . . 350

HEBREWS.

1[2ff.] . . . 73
1[3] . . . 338
2[8] . . . 150
2[9] . . . 201
2[10] . . 173, 203
4[12] . . . 64
4[14] . 172, 346, 368
4[14ff.] . . . 73 f.
6[2] . . . 212
6[4] . . . 345
7[1] . . . 81
7[3. 25f.] . . . 74
8[6] . . . 345
9[14] . . . 263
9[15] . . . 345
10[21] . . . 346
10[22] . . . 225
10[32] . . 345, 371
11[3] . . . 82
12[2] . . 173, 203
12[24] . . . 345
13[10] . . 73, 253
13[20] . . 346, 371

JAMES.

PAGE

1[13] . . . 47
1[17] . 47, 76, 351
1[18] . . . 351
1[21] . . . 54
1[23f.] . . . 76
2[2] . . . 209
3[2] . . . 179
3[6] . . . 76 f.
3[12] . . . 51
5[12] . . . 44
5[14f.] . . . 236
5[17] . . . 192

1 PETER.

— . . . 15
1[1] . . . 204
1[2] . . . 263
1[3] . . . 226
1[23] . . 54, 226
2[2] . 225 f., 347 f.
2[3] . . . 253
2[4] . . . 348
2[9] . . . 47
2[17] . . . 348
2[25] . . 346, 371
3[4] . . . 75
3[19f.] . . **198 ff.**
3[21] . . . 225
3[22] . . . 106
4[3] . . . 63
5[1] . . . 210
5[4] . . 346, 371
5[8] . . . 134

2 PETER.

1 . . . 351
1[3f.] . . . 47
1[4] . . . 351
2[4] . . . 11
2[22] . . . 50
3[5ff.] . . . 163
3[7] . . . 161
3[8] . . . 164
3[10ff.] . . 161, 164
3[13] . . . 165

1 JOHN.

1[1] . . . 74
1[7] . . . 47
2[1] . . . 362
3[9] . . . 54
4[8] . . . 47
4[9] . . . 356
5[6ff.] . . **227 f.**
5[7f.] . . 204, 228

2 JOHN.

v.[1] . . . 210

3 JOHN.

PAGE

v.[1] . . . 210

JUDE.

— . . . 337
v.[6] . . . 11
v.[9] . 11, 93, 173, 368
v.[17f.] . . . 118
v.[21] . . . 204

REVELATION.

1[4] . 83, 85, 208
1[5] . . . 263
1[8] . . . 345
1[10] . . . 197
1[12] . . . 85
1[13] . . 150, 154
1[16] . . . 85
1[18] . . 199, 326
1[20] . . . 85
1[20ff.] . . . 110
2 f. . . . 87
2[1] . . 85, 88
2[8] . . . 88
2[10] . . . 174
2[12] . . . 88
2[17] . . . 237
2[18] . . . 88
2[28] . . . 94
3[1] . . 83, 85, 88
3[4f.] . . . 174
3[5] . . . 84
3[7] . . 89, 326
3[12] . . . 237
3[14] . . . 89
3[15. 16f.] . . . 88
4[4] . . . 95
4[5] . . 83, 85, 97
4[6f.] . . . 97
4[10] . . . 96
5[1] . . . 124
5[3] . . 343f., 371
5[5] . . . 105
5[6] . 83, 85, 104
6[1ff.] . . 89, 117
6[2ff.] . . . 125
6[6. 8] . . . 118
6[9ff.] . . . 90
6[11] . . . 174
6[12f.] . . . 137
7[1] . . . 110
7[3] . . . 237
7[9] . . . 174
7[14] . . . 105

REVELATION—*contd.*

PAGE

8[2] . . 83, 85
8[2ff.] . . . 89
8[3] . . 89, 94
8[7] . . . 118
8[7ff.] . . . 117
8[9ff.] . . . 118
8[10] . . 138 f.
8[10f.] . . . 123
9[1] . . 108, 138
9[4] . . . 237
9[11] . . 127, 368
9[16ff.] . . 127, 368
10[3f.] . . . 118
11[2] . . . 142
11[2f.] . . . 368
11[3] . . . 142
11[3ff. 4] . . . 140
11[6] . . . 117
11[7] . . 128, 141
11[9] . 128, 142, 368
11[11] . . 142. 368
11[19] . . . 304
12 . 8, 133, **303 ff.**
12[1] . . 101, 304
12[2] . . . 146
12[3] . . 128, 132
12[4] . 132, 137, 160
12[6] . . . 304
12[7] . . 93, 110
12[7ff.] . . . 11
12[9] . . 128, 160
12[13] . . . 160
12[14] . . . 304
12[15] . . . 130
12[17] . . . 141
13[1] . . 130, 132
13[1f.] . . . 128
13[3] . . . 130
13[5] . . 142, 368
13[5f.] . . . 131
13[6] . . . 132
13[8] . . . 84
13[11] . 105, 128, 132
13[16f.] . . 233, 237
14[1] . . . 237
14[4] . . . 54
14[9] . . 233, 237
14[10] . . . 237
14[11] . . . 233
14[13] . . . 172 f.
14[18] . 94, 110, 248
15 . . . 86
15[2] . . . 97

REVELATION—*contd.*

PAGE

16[1ff.] . . . 117
16[2] . . . 233
16[5] . . . 110
16[7] . . . 248
16[13] . . . 127 f.
16[16] . . . 127
16[17] . . . 113
17 . . . 134
17[1] . . . 130
17[3] . . 128, 132
17[8] . . 84, 130
17[10] . . . 125
17[11] . . . 130
17[12ff.] . . . 132
17[14] . . . 351
19[7ff.] . . . 320
19[8] . . . 174
19[11ff.] . . . 303
19[13] . . . 74
19[16] . . . 351
19[17f.] . . . 166
19[20] 128, 161, 162 f., 233, 237
20[2] . . . 128
20[3] . . . 160
20[3f.] . . . 161
20[4] . . . 233
20[8] . . . 128
20[10] . 128, 160 ff.
20[12] . . . 84
20[13] . . . 169
20[14f.] . . 161 ff.
20[15] . . . 84
21[1] 161 (cp. 132), 165
21[6] . . . 345
21[8] . . 63, 161 ff.
21[9] . . . 320
21[12ff.] . . . 101
21[14] . . . 350
21[16] . . . 165
21[17] . . . 167
21[19f.] . . . 101
21[21] . . . 97
21[22] . . . 58
21[23] . . 105, 166
21[25] . . . 166
21[27] . . . 84
22[1ff.] . . . 167
22[4f.] . . . 166
22[13] . . . 345
22[15] . . . 63
22[16] . . . 94
22[17] . . . 320

C.—APOCRYPHA.

2 Esdras.

	PAGE
—	180
$5^{4f.}$	138
5^{6}	128
$6^{1ff.}$	339
6^{26}	140
$6^{49ff.}$	166
7^{29}	150
13^{3}	152, 157 (cp. 294)
$13^{3ff.}$	151
13^{12}	154
13^{25}	152, 157 (cp. 294)
$13^{33ff.}$	128
13^{51}	152, 157 (cp. 294)
$14^{38ff.}$	255

Tobit.

—	272
3^{8}	112
$4^{7ff.}$	177
7^{10}	330
12^{15}	83
$13^{6.\ 10}$	351

Wisdom.

—	58, 180
3^{8}	103
5^{19}	343
6^{22}	103
7^{22}	339, 356
7^{26}	338
8^{5}	339
8^{14}	103
8^{20}	361
9^{9}	339
9^{15}	68
$10^{17ff.}$	218
$12^{3ff.}$	63
$13^{2ff.}$	107
14^{15}	202
$14^{22ff.}$	63
16^{20} 19^{7}	218

Sirach.

3^{22}	32
15^{3}	245
17^{17}	94
23^{16}	62
24^{21}	245
24^{32}	200
25^{24}	180
36^{19}	351
$48^{10f.}$	140

Baruch.

4^{8}	344

Susanna.

$v.^{35\ (42)}$	344

1 Maccabees.

$9^{54ff.}$	343

2 Maccabees.

13^{4}	351

D.—APOCALYPTIC AND OTHER LITERATURE.

Apoc. Baruch.

	PAGE
—	180
29^{4}	166
29^{7}	171
36^{3} 39^{7}	363
40^{1}	128
54^{3}	108

Apoc. Moses.

—	180
§ 25	62
§§ 29, 38, 40	171

Apoc. Zephaniah.

—	305

Asc. Isaiah.

$9^{32.\ 36}$	205

Assump. Moses.

1^{14}	346
$8^{1ff.}$	128
$10^{4ff.}$	138

Didache.

—	185
9^{2}	363
14^{1}	241
$16^{3f.}$	128

Enoch (Ethiopic).

$18^{2f.}$	100
20	83
20^{5}	93
$22^{2.\ 9}$	169
$46^{1.\ 2ff.}$ 48^{3}	151
$52^{2ff.}$	125
56	128
$60^{7ff.}$	166
61^{10}	205
$62^{5.\ 7.\ 9.\ 14}$	151
$62^{15f.}$	174
63^{11}	151
67^{4}	125
$69^{26ff.}$ 70^{1} $71^{14.\ 17}$	151
72	139
$72^{2ff.}$ $75^{4ff.}$	101
$80^{4ff.}$	138
$82^{4ff.}$	100 f.
90^{16}	128
102^{2}	138

Enoch (Slavonic).

4^{1}	95
9	177
$22^{11ff.}$	84
23^{5}	361
27^{3} 30^{3}	86
30^{16}	62
$32^{2ff.}$	193
49^{2} 58^{5}	361

Ep. Aristeas.

135 ff.	202

Ep. Barnabas.

15^{9}	192 f.

Jubilees.

$16^{12f.}$	297
$23^{13.\ 16f.}$	118

4 Maccabees.

$1^{20ff.}$	63
1^{35}	62
2^{15}	63
2^{21} 7^{18}	62

Psalms of Solomon.

$2^{28f.}$	129
$15^{4f.}$	163
$18^{6ff.}$	173

Sibylline Oracles.	PAGE
— . . .	161
iii. 63 . . .	137
iii. 663 . . .	128
iii. 777 ff. . .	165
iii. 801 f. . .	138

Sib. Oracles—*contd.*	PAGE
iv. 164 f. . . .	213

Test. Job.	
46 ff. . . .	210

Test. Patriarchs.	PAGE
— . .	115 f., 179
Levi 8 . . .	83
Dan 6 . . .	346
Jos. 19 . .	104, 292

III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

αἰώνιον ἁμάρτημα, 321.
ἀλλότρια) (*ἴδια*, 57.
ἄλφα, τό, καὶ τὸ ὦ, 345.
ἁμαρτωλός, 284.
ἀμνός, 105.
ἀνακρίνειν, 65.
ἄνω (*ὁ ἄνω ἄνθρωπος*), 158.
ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι, 231.
ἀπερίσπαστος, 56.
ἀποκάλυψις, 210.
ἀπολλύναι, 67, 127.
ἀρνίον, 104 f.
ἄρρητα ῥήματα, 233.
ἀρτιγέννητος, 226.
ἀρχαί, 110.
ἀρχηγός, 203.
ἀρχιποίμην, 347.
ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, 110.

βάθος, 107.
βάκχοι, 258.
βαρεῖσθαι, 68.
βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, 166.
βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων, 351.
βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, 128.
Βοανηργές, 90.

γλώσσῃ, γλώσσαις, λαλεῖν, 210.

διάκονοι, 212.
δίψυχος, 102.
δυνάμεις, 106.

εἰκών, 158, 338.
εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ, 217, 224.
εἰς Χριστὸν βαπτίζειν, 223.
ἐκπτύειν, 342, 370.
ἐλευθερία, ἐλευθεροῦν, 60.
ἐν, 224; *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*, 233.
ἐνδύεσθαι, 232.
ἔνθεος, 257.
ἐξουσίαι, 110.
ἔξω, ἔσω, ἄνθρωπος, 68.
ἐπίγειος, 68.
ἐπίσκοποι, 212.
εὐλογητός, 81.
θεόπνευστος, 350, 371.
θεός, 337.
θεοφόρητος μανία, 350.
θρόνοι, 110.

ἰδιώτης, 212.
Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρία, 307.
Ἰησοῦς Βαραββᾶς, 185.

καθήκοντα, τὰ μή, 63.
κηρύττειν, 67.
Κισσός, 258.
κοινωνοὶ θείας φύσεως, 351.
κοινωνία, 247 f., 250, 253.
κρυπτά, 32.
κυριακὴ ἡμέρα, 197.
κύριος, 337.
κυριότητες, 110.

λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοί, 123.
λογικὴ λατρεία, 72.
λόγος σπερματικός, 54.
λύεσθαι, 50.

μέγιστος, 352.
μεσίτης, 346.
μεταμορφοῦσθαι, 68.
μετάνοια, 43, 232.
μετέχοντες, 261.
μνημεῖον, 187.
μονογενής, 356.
μορφή, 158.

Ναζαρηνός, 307 f.
Ναζωραῖος, **306 ff.**
νεᾶνις, 292.
νεόφυτος, 226.
νικᾶν, 126.
Νοῦς, 353, 355.

ὁμοίωμα, 339.
οὐρανός, **319 f.**, 370.

παραδιδόναι, 233.
παράκλητος, 205 f., 363, 371.
παραλαμβάνειν, 233.

παρθένος, 292.
πλήρωμα, 348 f.
πνεῦμα, 224, 312.
πρεσβύτεροι, 369 f. (cp. 209 f.).
προσηκάμην, 256.
προφητεία, 210.
προφήτης, 210.

Σαμαναῖοι, 35.
Σαρμᾶνες, 35.
σάρξ, 62, 224.
σεβαστή, 197.
σπαραγμός, 258.
στίγματα, 232.
στοιχεῖα, 106, 109 f.
συλλήμψη, 289.
σύμφυτον γίνεσθαι, 222, 232.
συναγωγή, 209, 369.
σφραγίζεσθαι, 233.
σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 241, 248.

τέλειος, 233 (cp. 46).
τέλος, 211.
τετέλεσται, 187.
τροχὸς τῆς γενέσεως, 76 f.

ὕψιστος, 80 f.
ὕψωμα, 107.

φιλανθρωπία, 350.
φῶς, 351.
φωστῆρες, 106.
φωτίζειν, 345, 371.
φωτισμός, 233.

Χριστιανοί, 258.

ψαλμός, 210.

ᾠδός, 210.

IV. INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS.

Aall, 33, 74, 338, 353, 354.
Allard, 263.
Althaus, 223.
Amélineau, 176, 207.
Andersen, 253.
Anquetil Duperron, 3.
Anrich, 7, 216, 231, 245, 266.
Anz, 23, 86 f., 207, 229, 230, 320, 323.
Arnim, von, 64, 109, 164.

Badham, 292, 297.
Bäntsch, 79, 121.
Baljon, 13, 228.
Barrows, 9, 202, 358.
Baudissin, 21, 116, 319, 341.
Bauer, A., 15.
Bauer, B., 2, 6, 16, 41, 43, 44, 57, 58, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 73, 75, 164.
Bauer, W., 126, 160, 199, 345, 359.
Baumgarten, 228.
Beal, 302, 311, 313, 318, 322, 331, 358.
Beer, 91, 125, 267, 275, 324.
Bellangé, 77.
Bergh, van den, van Eysinga, 7, 9, 34, 37, 72, 164, 192, 200, 241, 253, 295, 312, 313, 315, 317, 325, 328, 329, 330, 331, 357, 358.
Bertholet, 15, 84, 91, 151, 152.
Besant, Mrs. Annie, 6.
Bezold, 286.
Bittlinger, 229.
Böhmer, J., 14, 166.
Böhtlingk, 15.
Böklen, 10, 122, 123, 137, 139, 141, 153, 154, 157, 159, 161, 162, 165, 166, 170, 172, 173, 174, 188, 294, 299, 343.
Boll, 98, 99, 345.
Bolland, 13, 16, 336.
Bonhöffer, 44, 45, 46, 56, 211.
Bousset, 12, 18, 28, 33, 55, 64, 74, 81, 82, 84, 85, 87, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 133, 135, 137, 138, 140, 141, 142, 147, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160, 161, 163, 166, 167, 168, 171, 172, 174, 178, 179, 180, 182, 188, 198, 199, 213 f., 216, 223, 229, 236, 237, 241, 245, 250, 251, 255, 303, 304, 305, 319, 320, 323, 324, 326, 330, 339, 340, 351.
Box, 290, 292.
Brandis, 89.
Brandt, 12, 34, 90, 133, 178, 193, 207, 229, 237, 264, 354, 364.
Brückner, 15, 149, 179, 188, 193, 267, 275, 301, 308, 336.
Budge, 97.
Bunsen, 5.
Burnouf, 5, 358.
Butler, 13, 186 f., 241.

Calkoen, 4.
Campbell, 14.

Carman, 297.
Carus, 15, 142, 191, 193.
Casartelli, 159.
Chantepie de la Saussaye, 22, 28, 29.
Chapuis, 213, 256.
Charles, 81, 288.
Cheetham, 242.
Cheyne, 12, 17, 77 f., 80, 93, 114, 132, 151, 160, 170, 177, 188, 292, 293, 298, 299, 300, 316, 324, 334, 356.
Clemen, 12, 70, 107, 108, 179, 198, 200, 222, 224, 227, 251, 336, 363.
Cohn, 257.
Conybeare, 291, 296, **297**.
Corssen, 291.
Cowell, 200.
Cremer, 350.
Cumont, 1, 2, 24, 26, 27, **30 ff.**, 81, 87, 92, 96, 109, 115, 163, 171, 181, 182, 207, 231, 260, 261, 263, 299, 308, 309, 319, 342, 344, 345, 347, 364.
Curtiss, 22, 113, 311, 360.
Curtius, 59, 70, 73.

Damilaville, 3.
Darmesteter, 26, 264.
Davids, Rhys, 37, 164, 313, 322 f., 328, 329.
Deissmann, 14, 47, 64, 75, 174, 197, 205, 210, 224, 232, 259, 299, 310, 323, 336, 337, 341, 343, 347, 351 f., 363.
Delitzsch, 10, 78, 101, 111, 169, 177, 181.
Dieterich, 32, 51, 63, 85, 164, 169, 174, 230, 231, 232, 233, 259, 261, 298, 299, 301, 303, 321, 347, 365.
Diettrich, 177.
Dietze, 336.
Dillmann, 184.
Dobschütz, von, 216, 218, 222, 223, 225, 226, 227, 232, 247 f., 249, 251, 253, 256 f., 343.
Drews, 15, 16, 34, 308, 327, 336, 363.
Duhm, B., 129, 136, 139, 143, 145, 255.
Duhm, H., 85, 114, 129.
Dupuis, 3 f., 41, 85, 86, 87, 95, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 105, 188, 293, 303, 304, 326, 358.
Dussaud, 293, 308.

Edmunds, 8 f., 309, 321, 329, 331, 359, 361.
Edwards, 65.
Eichthal, d', 80.
Elter, 1, 203.
Everling, 112.

Falke, 365.
Farnell, 237, 258.
Feine, 13, 59, 60, 61, 63, 67, 75, 256, 257, 305.
Fiebig, 13, 102, 104, 105, 185, 188, **189 ff.**, 194, 292, 300.
Fischer, 76.
Flügel, 133.
Förster, 301.
Franckh, 292, 293.
Franke, 164, 295, 298, 302, 311, 313, 322, 325, 331, 359, 360, 362 f.
Frazer, 183, 230.
Friedländer, M., 32.
Fries, 32, 112.

Garbe, 82.
Gardiner, A. H., 148.
Gardner, P., 198, 241.
Geffcken, 58, 60, 107, 155.
Gehrich, 21.
Geiger, 24, 25, 27, 28, 96, 111, 112, 113, 115, 123, 152, 324.
Geldner, 28.
Gfrörer, 204 f.
Giesebrecht, 237.
Goblet d'Alviella, 182 f.
Götz, 239, 240.
Goguel, 241, 245.
Goldziher, 78.
Grafe, 77.
Granger, 33.
Gray, L. H., 24, 92.
Grenfell, Miss Alice, 14, 97, 99, 163, 354.
Gressmann, 12 f., 85, 119, 120, 121, 122, 125, 135, 136, 138, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 156, 161, 162, 166, 174, 359.
Grill, 82, 151, 154, 157, 203, 290, 296, 321, 340, 353, 354, 356, 359, 362.
Grützmacher, 289, 291.
Gruppe, 74, 81, 85, 136, 159, 233, 257, 261, 262, 299, 314, 341, 345.
Grussendorf, 216, 264.
Gunkel, 5, 8, 18, 20 f., 78, 84, 85, 87, 91, 95, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 104, 111, 112, 119, 120, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 131, 132, 134, 138, 139, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 152, 153, 161, 175, 176, 177, 180, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 194, 197, 198, 216, 225, 253, 263, 287, 289, 294, 295, 296, 303, 304, 306, 316, 318, 319, 320, 323, 324, 326, 327, 333, 339, 340, 341, 346, 348, 351, 358.

Hardy, 35, 38.
Harnack, 30, 42, 81, 118, 202 f., 216, 245, 290, 310.

Harris, 63.
Hase, von, 295, 302, 312.
Haupt, 73.
Hauschild, 210.
Havet, E., 6, 322.
Hehn, 14, 87, 206, 338.
Heinrici, 15, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 211, 258.
Heitmüller, 11, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, **224**, 228, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 245, 246, 247, 251, 252, 255, 256, 257, 258, 260, 326, 345, 352, 356, 358, 361.
Hepding, 230, 233, 263, 347.
Herder, 3.
Hilgenfeld, 70, 291.
Hillmann, 290, 296.
Hinneberg, 37, 131, 138, 175.
Hochart, 7.
Hoffmann, 245, 259, 265.
Hollmann, 14.
Holtzmann, H., 76, 200 f., 216, 228, 233, 245, 248, 252, 260, 290, 298, 326, 359.
Holtzmann, O., 46, 47, 50, 55, 239, 253, 255, 363.
Holwerda, 28.
Holzinger, 108 f., 184.
Hommel, 132.
Hopkins, 18, 35, 37, 38, 82, 302, 325, 360, 365.
Huschke, 124.

Innitzer, 214.
Issleib, 15, 293.

Jackson, A. V. Williams, 24, 25, 27, 92, 96, 111, 112, 113, 115, 123, 152, 302, 324.
Jackson, H. Latimer, 291.
Jacobi, 332.
Jacoby, 15.
Jacolliot, 5.
Jäger, 177.
James, 210.
Jastrow, 122, 153.
Jensen, 13, 16, 97, 98, 99, 101, 105, 113, 122, 131, 132, 152, 180, 188, 191, **267 ff.**, 304.
Jéquier, 176.
Jeremias, 5, 10 f., 12, 13, 79, 82, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 111, 112, 121, 122, 129, 131, 132, 135, 146, 148, 149, 152, 167, 181, 184, 189, 263 f., 292, 293, 299, 300, 301, 302, 304, 306, 310, 313, 320, 324, 327, 333, 344, 363.
Jevons, 14, 183.
Jong, de, 360.
Jülicher, 43, 49, 52, 53, 56, 74, 118, 216, 220, 332, 340.

Kalthoff, 12, 16.
Karppe, 346.
Kattenbusch, 290.
Kautzsch, 91, 125, 152, 323, 339.
Keane, 302.
Keats, 4.
Keim, 1.
Kennedy, 15, 16.
Kepler, 300.
Kern, 36.
Kessler, 34, 93, 125, 133, 229, 264, 319.
Kircher, 101, 300.
Kirn, 74.
Kleinert, 126.
Klostermann, E., 45, 48, 51.
Knobel, 184.
Koch, 15.
Köberle, 130.
Köhler, F., 226, 351.
Köhler, L., 289, 290, 291, 299.
Köhler, W., 13, 326, 327.
König, 78, 104, 129 f., 181, 309, 344.
Kohut, 5, 92.
Krenkel, 342.
Krüger, 205, 208.
Kuenen, 18, 77, 108.
Kuhn, 299. *See* also "Geiger."

Lake, Kirsopp, 226.
Lange, 22.
Lechler, 2, 3.
Lefmann, 200.
Lenormant, 101.
Lidzbarski, 81.
Lieblein, 163.
Lietzmann, 29, 30, 34, 44, 45, 48, 51, 53, 55, 56, 58, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 72, 81, 107, 113, 203, 216, 218, 230, 231, 233, 245, 248, 253, 259, 260, 296, 310, 319, 338, 342, 349, 350.
Lightfoot, J. B., 55, 57, 71.
Lillie, 7.
Lipsius, 307.
Littmann, 188.
Loisy, 16, 219, 247, 290.
Loofs, 201.
Lorinser, 38, 365.
Lotz, 129.
Lublinski, 15, 16, 336.
Lueken, 93, 349.

Maass, 303.
Macfie, 6.
Marti, 78, 119, 120, 125, 129, 143, 144, 145, 150.
Maspero, 82.

Maurenbrecher, 149.
Mayor, J. E. B., 61.
Meinhold, 119, 120, 143.
Merx, 56, 238, 289, 296.
Metzger, 14.
Meyboom, 307.
Meyer, A., 188, 190, 194, 199, 333, 340, 341, 352, 354.
Meyer, E., 24, 121, 129, 148, 178.
Meyer, H. A. W., 56, 63, 73, 74, 290.
Michel, 352.
Mills, 11, 173.
Moffatt, 4, 10, 28, 80, 94, 97, 111, 112, 127, 141, 154, 166, 173, 177, 188, 343.
Mommsen, 310.
Monnier, 199.
Mordtmann, 356.
Moret, 354.
Müller, M., 325.
Müller, M. W., 14, 125 f.

Nestle, 300, 316.
Nève, 302, 365.
Nöldeke, 293.
Norden, 58, 59, 74.
Nork, 4, 18, 95, 98, 99.

Oesterley, 115, 144, 146.
Oldenberg, 17 f., 91, 147, 312, 322 f., 365.
Orelli, von, 15, 175.
Oussani, 298.

Palmer, Smythe, 159.
Parthey, 347.
Paton, 184 f.
Perdelwitz, 15, 134.
Petersen, 290, 291, 292, 308, 310.
Petrie, Flinders, 33.
Pfleiderer, E., 68, 363.
Pfleiderer, O., 11, 61, 63, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 91, 104, 105, 116, 157, 188, 196, 198, 215, 237, 241, 242, 245, 246, 260, 262, 263, 290, 295, 296, 299, 301, 302, 309, 310, 311 312, 313, 317, 324, 330, 341, 363.
Pischel, 37, 312, 317.
Porter, 118, 151.
Preuschen, 300.

Radau, 11.
Radermacher, 169.
Ramsay, 210.
Reinach, 118, 183, 347.
Reitzenstein, 10, 33, 92, 95, 106, 107, 109, 113, 155, 156, 157, 208, 210, 228 f., 231, 234, 259, 289, 321, 324, 340, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 354, 355.
Renan, 301.
Rénaudot, 239.
Rendtorff, 216, 222.
Reuss, 2.
Réville, A., 80.
Réville, J., 250, 308.
Révillout, 176.
Richter, 4 f., 85, 105, 303.
Riehm, 126.
Robertson, J. M., 9, 82, **183 ff.**, 326, 327, 336, 358.
Rönsch, 330.
Rohde, 203, 231.
Roscher, 335.

Sayce, 153.
Schiaparelli, 109.
Schiele, 153.
Schleiermacher, 308.
Schmidt, H., 14, 129, 130, 152, 199.
Schmidt, N, 151, 157.
Schmiedel, 77, 296, 299, 300.
Schnedermann, 65.
Schneider, H., 293.
Scholten, 228.
Schrader, 5.
Schürer, 55, 62, 81, 193, 194, 197, 209, 362, 364.
Schwartz, 194, 197.
Schwöbel, 310.
Scultetus, 2, 65.
Seeberg, A., 222.
Sellin, 32.
Senart, 35.
Seydel, **6 f.**, 9, 16, 18, 34, 36, 37 f., 124, 176, 200, 207, 295, 298, 300, 302, 309, 311, 312, 313, 315, 317, 318, 320, 321, 322, 325, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 333, 334, 335, 357, 360, 361, 362, 364.
Siegfried, 153.
Simpson, W., 183.
Siouffi, 264.
Smend, 134.
Smith, W. B., 13, 16, 53f., **306 f.**, 336.
Soden, von, 76, 349.
Söderblom, 115, 123, 133, 147, 160, 161, 163, **170**, 171, 178, 343.
Sokolowski, 216.
Soltau, 2, 14, 199, 206, 207, 252, 296, 298, 299, 301, 310, 314, 352.
Sonny, 52.
Spiegel, 264.
Spiegelberg, 79.
Spiess, 2, 54, 60, 65, 69, 71.
Spitta, 45, 290.
Stade, 20, 22, 108, 112, 114.
Stärk, 107, 131, 245.
Stapfer, 352.
Stave, 8, 28, 77, 80, 91, 94, 111, 112, 114, 126, 160, 170, 209.

Steck, 7, 41, 61, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72.
Stern, 305.
Stocks, 136.
Strauss, 296, 298, 300, 301, 308, 309, 313, 326, 333.
Stucken, 103.
Suphan, 3.

Teichmann, 223.
Tennant, 153, 180, 181.
Theile, 76.
Thieme, 197, 210, 212, 310, 341, 350.
Thumb, 197.
Tiele, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, **27 f.**, 38, 92, 109, 115, 116, 200, 209, 302, 319, 324, 365.
Titius, 63, 69.
Tröltsch, 2.

Uhlhorn, 341.
Usener, 60, 206, 207 f., 289, 290, 291, 296, 297, 299, 301, 306, 314, 315, 316, 333.

Vallée-Poussin, de la, 19, 295, 309, 321, 362.
Vischer, 303.
Völter, 12, 127, 133, 151, 166.
Vollmer, 62.
Voltaire, 115.
Volz, 140, 146, 147, 174.

Wagner, 310.
Waitz, 341.
Weber, 36, 82, 335, 358.
Weinel, 245, 290, 291, 293, 298, 299, 308, 336, 348, 351.
Weiss, J., 56, 57, 60, 66, 71, 105, 118, 124, 126, 134, 166, 196, 198, 216, 220, 225, 226, 228, 236, 237, 241, 245, 250, 251, 253, 263, 287, 290, 296, 300, 302, 308, 318, 326, 328, 346, 347, 348, 349, 351, 352, 358, 361.
Wellhausen, 136, 196, 226, 228, 237, 253, 291.
Wendland, 29, 41, 44, 50, 53, 55, 74, 81, 113, 155, 203, 257, 296, 310, 319, 338, 341, 342, 349, 350.
Wendt, 226.
Wernle, 59, 63, 213, 216, 229, 314.
West, 100.
Wetstein, 43, 44, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 60, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 72, 75, 76, 97, 309, 316, 326, 329, 333, 335.
Wiedemann, 148, 202, 293.
Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, von, 310.
Wildeboer, 176.
Wilke, 80, 90, 344.
Willrich, 318.
Winckler, 5, 10, 12, **78 f.**, 82, 88, 89, 90, 99, 102, 103, 121, 184, 334.
Windelband, 70, 71 f.
Windischmann, 96.
Winternitz, 39.
Wobbermin, 8, 231, 345.
Wrede, 43, 216, 245, 252, 355.
Wünsche, 153.
Wundt, 267, 303.

Zahn, 43, 44, 52, 55, 56, 57, 76, 124, 211.
Zeller, 35, 45, 55, 62, 63, 64, 70, 164.
Zielinski, 33.
Zimmern, 5, 6, 78, 84, 86, 87, 89, 91, 94, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 121, 122, 125, 129, 131, 132, 133, 139, 142, 143, 148, 149, 152, 153, 154, 163, 167, 169, 177, 179, 180, 188, 189, 190, 191, 194, 198, 205, 206, 207, 229, 264, 267, 269, 286, 292, 293, 304, 314, 316, 320, 323, 328, 334, 339, 344, 351, 362.
Zurhellen, 214.

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED
Edinburgh

DATE DUE

DEC 10 1987

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library

43. Wetstein, Nov. Test. Graec. 1751.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall.